

THE  
MAGAZINE

OF

CHRISTIAN  
LITERATURE

VOL. I

NO. 1

OCTOBER

1889

Property of

CBPac

Please return to

Graduate Theological

Union Library

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE CO.

NEW YORK

SUBSCRIPTION  
\$2.00 PER YEAR

SINGLE COPIES  
PRICE, 20 CENTS

ISSUED MONTHLY.

Entered at the New York Post Office as second class matter

v. 1  
O. 1857-11. 1870

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

OCTOBER, 1889.

THE PAPACY, . . . . .	
MISSION WORK AMONG THE LEPERS, . . . . .	
THE BAPTIST WORK IN SWEDEN, . . . . .	
PRESIDENT WOOLSEY AND PROBATION AFTER DEATH, . . . . .	
THE TRUE STORY OF SERVETUS, . . . . .	
CHRISTIAN LITERATURE IN CHINA, . . . . .	
THE REVISION OF THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION, . . . . .	
HOW TO REACH THE MASSES, . . . . .	
DEACONESSSES IN AMERICA, . . . . .	
AN HOUR WITH HORATIUS BONAR, . . . . .	
THE CONTEST IN ITALY, . . . . .	
THE CONGREGATIONALIST MOVEMENT FOR LITURGIC SERVICE, . . . . .	
WITHOUT "SENSE, SCIENCE, OR SALVATION," . . . . .	
THE PROPOSAL FOR THE REVISION OF THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION, . . . . .	
THE REVISION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CONFESSION, . . . . .	
ENGLISH BISHOPS ON BROTHERHOODS, . . . . .	
THE ORIGIN AND THE USE OF THE CREED, . . . . .	
ON AGNOSTICISM, . . . . .	
PARAGRAPHIC, . . . . .	

## THE PAPACY :

## A REVELATION AND A PROPHECY.

*From The Contemporary Review (London), August, 1889.*

ON the centenary of the fall of the Bastille the Parisian mob looted the Café Imolfi, in the Rue Royale. The proprietor had omitted to decorate his premises, a pleasant resort, famous for its ices, and, being angrily ordered to display some bunting, unluckily so far forgot himself as to hoist the Italian flag. "The red fool fury of the Seine" blazed up instantly. In the twinkling of an eye the café and its contents were flung into the gutter, and its unlucky proprietor fled for his life to the protection of the police. It was a significant little incident, noted largely throughout Europe, but in no place more curiously than in the Eternal City, where at any moment the pent-up forces which demolished the Café Imolfi might break out into fierce collision and result in catastrophe. But in Rome the balance of force in the opposing elements is reversed. The Quirinal, which flaunts the Italian national flag before the gates of the Vatican, represents the material force of a united nation, while the Pope in his palace-prison is as powerless as was the café proprietor of the Rue Royale when the mob kicked his furniture into the street. Should a collision come, his only thought must be of flight. If the Pope could have asserted his authority by the arm of the flesh, he would have done so, in order to avert—or, if that were impossible, to avenge—the ceremony in honor of Giordano Bruno, which had taken place six weeks before. No incident of late years has so deeply wounded the sentiments of the rulers of the Church as the unveiling of the Bruno monument on June 9th. The Inquisition had burned Bruno in 1600, and, although the Church might have ignored the tribute paid to his memory, that was not the spirit in which the Bruno celebration was treated by the Vatican. The Pentecostal Festival was clouded by a gloom that could be felt. The whole Church was invited to share in the indignation with which its head regarded the sacrilege of the commemoration, and in every way the Pope made all men understand that the iron had entered into his soul. He spent the whole day in his private chapel, prostrate before the Blessed Sacrament ex-

posed on the altar, praying in the midst of the assembled prelates of his Court for an expiation of the blasphemies of Campo di Fiore. From Saturday till Wednesday morning no one was allowed to enter the Vatican but the ambassadors of foreign Powers accredited to the Holy See. It was to him as if the Abomination of Desolation had been set up in the Holy of Holies, and the unveiling of a statue to the heresiarch was proclaimed to be the outward and visible sign of the determination of the triumphant Revolution to press forward to the "overthrow of the sacred authority of the Pontiffs and the extirpation of the Christian faith."

The Sacred College of Cardinals was summoned to a most secret and extraordinary Consistory, in a form and under precautions which had only twice been adopted in the long reign of Pius IX. At this Consistory Leo XIII. communicated to his Cardinals the grave decision at which he had arrived. The solemn Allocution which he addressed to them, and which was subsequently published to the world, amounted practically to a Pontifical declaration that Rome was no longer a safe or tenable residence for the successor of St. Peter. The freedom of the Apostolic functions and the dignity of the Pontifical office, already impaired from of old by the usurpation of the Revolution, were now menaced with extinction by the growing insolence of the sects of evil. The daring of desperate men, unchained to every crime, driven on by the fierceness of lawless desires, could no longer be restrained; the city that was once the safe and inviolable seat of the Holy See was now the capital of a new impiety, where absurd and impudent worship was paid to human reason. "Hereby is rendered evident in what condition is placed the Supreme Head of the Church, the Pastor and the Teacher of the Catholic world." The other communications addressed by the Pope to the Princes of the Church at this most secret Consistory have not yet been divulged; but it is believed that the Pope was able to report a most important and reassuring statement as to the support which was assured to the Holy See in case that any further encroachment of a serious nature

NOTE.—The above article is reprinted in full. It has excited great interest and provoked much discussion.—Ed.



was made on the liberties of the Church. The Pope had received by special courier from Vienna a long autograph letter from the Emperor-King Francis Joseph, in which Innsbruck or Boozen was offered him as a residence—an offer previously made to Pius IX.—in case he was forced to leave Rome. The Emperor further assured the Pope that if the Italian Government were to proceed to lay a violent hand either upon the Vatican, the Lateran, or Castel Gondolfo, or any part of these three palaces secured to the Holy See by the Law of Guarantees, Austria would regard it as a *casus belli*—the Triple Alliance notwithstanding.

Whatever consolation these assurances may have given to the Cardinals, must have been damped by the announcement that the new Penal Code, which empowers the Courts to consign to prison any priest whose discourses are objected to by the civil authorities, had received the Royal Assent that very day. The struggle between the Church and the State, it was recognized, had entered upon a new and probably a decisive campaign, and the Pope, as generalissimo of the forces of the Church, began by preparing for what may at any moment become an inevitable retreat. It is understood that should war break out between France and Italy, or should the quarrel between the Quirinal with its Penal Code and the Vatican with its clergy result in open conflict, the Pope will leave Rome and seek refuge on the Balearic Islands. From that retreat, sheltered by the Spanish flag and secured from interference by the fleets of Europe, the Holy Father will carry on the government of the Church until such time as the restoration of peace shall enable him to return to re-establish the sovereignty of the Holy See in the city of the Cæsars.

## II.

IN Europe there are at this moment but three men who stand out above their fellows as the supreme representatives of various kinds of power. Alexander III. represents the authority of material force; Prince Bismarck the might of scientific organization; and Leo XIII. the strength of the Catholic world. Of the three the Pope is the most interesting and the most autocratic. His empire is vaster than that of the Russian Czar, and before his authority even the imperious Chancellor has been compelled to bow. Although a prisoner in his own palace, he is ruler of a dominion as wide as the world, and there is no language spoken among men wherein his word is not recognized as the voice of a master. There is a

loneliness and a mystery about Leo that differentiates him from the other potentates of our day. Prince Bismarck is intensely human. He stands before us as the very incarnation of masterful man. He lives before us, complete in all human relations, with his wife, his sister, his sons, his dogs, his pipe, and his beer; he touches the common life of his day at every point. It is the same with the Czar: although in his case he is more withdrawn from the public gaze, he shares not less fully the ordinary life of the ordinary man. As father, as husband, as master, as friend, he is a man among men; nor does the burden of empire separate him from the simple family joys and natural every-day cares of the human home. But the Pope stands apart. He sleeps as other men, and eats as they, but a great gulf yawns between him and other mortals. He has a palace, but he is without a home. He has servants and domestic friends; but the celibacy which for centuries has been imposed upon the clergy of his Church debars him from the deepest and most human of all relationships. He has never known the joys nor suffered the sorrows which make up a great part of the higher life of the ordinary man. He has lived and lives apart, alone, divorced from nature that he may be consecrated to the service of his Church, without wife or child, that he may care solely for the Bride of the Lamb, and watch more sedulously over the welfare of those who are of the household of faith.

The Pope, thus excluded from the healthy human life of the family, clings all the more passionately to the local surroundings which serve him as a substitute for home. His centre is not a home. It is Rome. The result is that the disadvantages which celibacy was established to avert, reappear in another shape. He that is married careth for the things that are of the world—how he may please his wife; whereas he that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord. For the world and the wife, read Rome and its sovereignty, and it is equally true of the Popes. The local anxieties, the temporal government of the city in which the Popes succeeded the Cæsars, have become as cramping and crippling to the successors of St. Peter as the household cares that might have encompassed them had they all imitated the Fisherman, who had not only a wife, but a mother-in-law. It is this which gives such strange interest to the position of Leo XIII. at the present moment. He is distracted between conflicting ideals—ex-

actly as a good father of a family is often torn asunder between the claims of his household and the claims of the world at large. The struggle which is going on in the Vatican is but the latest phase of the conflict which the apostle declared troubled the married man who had to reconcile the desire to please the Lord and to please his wife.

As some men never have any divine call that leads them to discharge duties outside their own doorstep, so some Popes have never recognized the existence of duties incompatible with their primary fealty to the local interests of the Italian town in which they have spent their lives. That which distinguishes Leo XIII. is that before his mind there has passed a vision of a higher and nobler ideal than that of being the mere temporal master of the Eternal City. He has seen, as it were in a dream, a vision of a wider sovereignty than any which the greatest of his predecessors had ever realized, and before his eyes there has been unfolded a magnificent conception of a really universal Church, as "lofty as the love of God, and wide as are the wants of men." But no sooner has he gazed with holy ecstasy on the world-wide dominion which lies almost within his grasp, than he turns with a sigh to the older and smaller ideal of the temporal sovereignty of Rome, which has bounded the horizon of so many of his predecessors, and which presses upon him like the atmosphere of the whole of his waking life. These are the two dreams, the two ideals, hopelessly antagonistic one to the other: but Leo helplessly clings to both.

To those who do not look at the world and its affairs from an out-of-the-way corner of the world from which the tide of Empire has long since ebbed, it is difficult to see how any comparison can be made between the two ideals which haunt the imagination of the Holy Father. It is, to put it vulgarly, all Lombard Street to a China orange in favor of the world-wide ideal. And yet there is to those who have been born and bred under Italian skies a strong and natural fascination about the ideal which centres in the re-establishment of Papal sovereignty in Rome. Rome is a name to conjure with. For more than two thousand years the Seven-hilled City was for weal or for woe more important than any other point in the world's surface. It is the only city which ever conquered a continent. Alike as the seat of the Republic, of the Empire, and of the Popedom of the Middle Ages, Rome was the capital of the world.

The broad arrow of Roman Empire is branded deep on the body of our civilization. Our law, our language, our habits, our religion—all have the impress of the Roman mint. The very air of Europe is impregnated with the ozone that streams, as from a perennial fountain, from the history of Rome. There is everything that can fascinate the imagination and stimulate the mind in the traditions that cling round the ruined walls of the Eternal City, nor can the least reverent be unconscious of the awe excited by the sacred shrines which for a thousand years have absorbed the devotion of the world.

"Mother of Arts as once of Arms; thy hand  
Was then our guardian, and is still our Guide.  
Parent of our religion!"

To reign in Rome might well rouse the loftiest ambition, and to lose the sovereignty of the Imperial City might rend the heart of the most callous of mortals. That great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth, and below whose feet St. John saw peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues, was, at any time between the days of the Scipios and the era of the Medici, the natural centre of any organization that sought to exercise world-wide dominion. Civilization grew up round the shores of the Mediterranean, that inland sea which was the cradle of the culture of the world. To a devout Catholic, not even the sacred sites which witnessed the passion of our Lord are more sacred than the city where the first martyrs, swathed in pitchy ceremonies, blazed as torches in the gardens of Nero, and where their descendants founded an empire more splendid than that of Augustus, more beneficent than that of the Antonines. The City of the Catacombs and of the Coliseum, where generation after generation of the most divinely gifted of our race have lavished the utmost resources of their art, their intellect, and their genius, may well seem marked out from of old to be the natural and eternal seat of the Vicegerent of God.

Apart from these considerations, which appeal to all men, the Roman Pontiffs have acquired in the course of ages, by mere force of inveterate habit, an instinct which renders it almost impossible for them to conceive of a Catholic Church which has not Rome as its centre. Use and wont are great deities even in the spiritual realm, and use and wont point to Rome and Rome alone as the centre of the Catholic world. Many a time the Popes have been driven from Rome: sometimes they have voluntarily left it: but sooner or later they have always return-



ed to it. The administration of the most gigantic polity known to man is centralized there. All roads lead to Rome, and from Rome there have issued since Christian civilization began the winged words of power and of life which have knit the Catholic world into one.

It is therefore natural that the Pope should cling to Rome, and should regard even his contemplated retreat to the Balearic Islands as but a temporary flight from a passing storm. Some day the sky will clear, and once more the Vicar of Christ will reoccupy the See of St. Peter. Equally natural is it that, being in Rome, he should wish to be master in his own house. Absolute independence is an indispensable condition for the free exercise of the spiritual power. This independence, according to English ideas, can best be obtained by the abandonment by the spiritual power of all temporal claims, and the recognition by the secular government that it has no authority in the spiritual realm. But this ideal, which can be realized where there is no antagonism between Church and State, is manifestly impossible where, as in Italy, the State is practically a rival Church, quite as determined to persecute as Torquemada or Calvin. Hence to the Pope it seems as part of the ordinance of God that he should dwell in Rome, and, being resident there, that he should reign in the Eternal City as its temporal lord, not because he cares for the sceptre of secular dominion, but because nothing short of sovereignty can, under the circumstances, secure him the freedom necessary for the exercise of his spiritual prerogatives. It is this which dominates the mind of Leo XIII. Waking or sleeping, the idea of restoring the lost temporal dominion of his predecessors never leaves him. It colors the whole texture of his thoughts, it influences his policy, and makes itself felt throughout the whole orbit of Pontifical action.

And here it may be observed in passing that, however absorbing may be the influence of Roman politics on the Holy See, at the present moment, when the restoration of its temporal sovereignty is but a theory or an aspiration, it is nothing to the distraction that would follow if the Pope were to be cursed with the burden of a granted prayer and set up once more on the throne of Rome. If the Italian Government cared to make a great *coup*, it could do so tomorrow by simply handing over to the Pope the sovereignty of the city of Rome. Leo XIII. would find himself hopelessly at a loss to discharge the duties of the position

for which he sighs. None of the indispensable instruments of government are ready to his hand. He has neither employés, financiers, police, soldiers, nor any other administrative officials. In less than a week the bad elements that lurk in every great city would have made a revolution, and in a fortnight the Italian troops would be enthusiastically welcomed as the only force by which Rome could be rescued from anarchy and bloodshed.

This, however, by the way. The Pope does not realize the truth, and the re-establishment of his temporal sovereignty is still his first dream, a dream of the dear dead past, hallowed no doubt by innumerable sacred associations, but limited, local, and fatally opposed to the realization of his other dream, which intermittently exercises a very powerful influence over his imagination. This second vision is infinitely more sublime than the restitution of the unimpaired sovereignty of the Papal See over all the ancient patrimony of the Church. Leo has dreamed of being really the Pastor of the world, in fact as well as in name. To be Vicegerent of God, and therefore representative of the Father of all men, is to stand *in loco parentis* to all the human race. The Church, the Lamb's Bride, is the mother of humanity. As head of the Church, he must care with a mother's love for all the children of the family. It matters not that many are orphaned from birth, knowing not of their divine parentage. It is for him to teach them of the Fatherhood of God, and to prove to them by infinite acts of helpful service the reality of the motherhood of the Church. No difference of creed, no blindness of negation, no obstinacy of unbelief, can shut out any human soul from the loving care of the shepherd to whom God has intrusted the guardianship of his flock. Humanity wanders in the wilderness: he will be its guide. The forces of evil abound, making sad havoc of the forlorn children of men: he will stand in the breach and cast the shield of divine grace and of human service over the victims of the Evil One. Men are ignorant: he will teach them. They are groping in the dark: he will lead them into light. Up from the void everywhere rises a despairing cry, Who will show us any good? And from the recesses of the Vatican palace he answers, "I will conduct you into the paths of all peace."

This, of course, or something like this, has ever been the aspiration of all the greater Popes. But Leo differs from his predecessors in being more under the influence of

the modern spirit, which has read a more mundane meaning into the words of Christ. It is reported of Anaxagoras that in his old age, having abandoned all interest in the politics of his time, he was reproached for ceasing to care for his country. "Be silent," he replied, "I have the greatest affection for my country," pointing upward as he spoke to the stars. It is in exactly the opposite direction that Leo has moved. No doubt, like all Christians, he would say that he set not his affections on things below, but on things above—that here he had no continuing city, but had a house eternal in the heavens; but that is no longer the note of Christian thought. Rather does he pray with our Lord, "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven;" and in his vision of things to come he sees the kingdoms of the earth become the Lord's and his Christ's. It is to establish the City of God in the hearts and the lives of men, not in the future or beyond the grave, but here and now, that he has been called to the Papal throne. Not from any mere lust of power and personal ambition, but with a genuine aspiration to be helpful to mankind, Leo dreams of re-establishing on a wider basis and a surer foundation the spiritual authority of Innocent III. and of Gregory VII. He feels himself called to make the Holy See once more the active and omnipresent embodiment of the conscience of mankind. He is to be the organ through which God speaks, not merely concerning dogmas as to the divine attributes, or in defining differences between orthodox and heretical subtleties, but as the living guide, the lively oracle from which all the races of mankind may derive the same practical and authoritative counsel that the Hebrews obtained from the Urim and the Thummim of their high-priest. Leo would fain be the Moses of the new Exodus of Humanity, their leader through the Wilderness of Sin to the Promised Land, in which all the evils of the existing society will be done away, and all things political and social will have become new.

Leo XIII. is, in short, a Pope who takes himself seriously, who believes in his divine mission, and who is penetrated by the conviction that the Church must address herself practically to the solution of all the pressing problems of life. *Homo sum, nihil humanum a me alienum puto*, takes with him a wider and nobler range. He is not merely a man among men, but representative of the God who hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth; therefore he must interest

himself in every department of human life. All this, which may seem to some but as the wildest lunacy, and to others as insufferable arrogance, has indeed a very solid foundation. Whatever may be said against the Catholic Church, it does unquestionably represent an immense moral force. The most bigoted Protestant may therefore rejoice at the prospect of this moral force being directed to practical ends. Hitherto unquestionably the Popes have not lived up to their privileges, and very few of them have even attempted to rise to the level of their opportunities. If Leo XIII. is really about to apply the vast moral force of which he is the official embodiment to the solution of the practical questions of the day, even those who are most sceptical about the supernatural grace on which he bases his claim, may well rejoice that so vast a moral influence is no longer to be wasted on theological peurileties and ecclesiastical trifles.

But, alas! the moment the Pope essays to make a step toward the realization of his world-wide ideal, he seems to be checked and thwarted by his earlier dream! When he would act as the conscience of mankind, he is in danger of being biassed by his aspiration to be an Italian prince. When he attempts to set up a supreme tribunal for the guidance of humanity, the Italian limitations are apt to baffle him, and instead of being cosmopolitan, catholic, and impartial, he is tempted to become Roman, local, and partisan. If he is really to rise to the height of his greater ideal, he will have to make up his mind to sacrifice the smaller. If he would spread his wings over the whole world, he must desist from attempting to creep back into his Roman chrysalis. The new Moses will not make much of a success of his Exodus if he is perpetually struggling to get back to the flesh-pots of Egypt.

### III.

THE best way to prove how incompatible are the two ideals is to set forth with such exactitude as is possible to those who have access to the best sources of information in Ireland and in Rome, the simple facts of the Persico mission. They illustrate forcibly the difficulties which render it impossible for any one who is first and foremost the Italian occupant of an Italian See adequately to fulfil the responsibilities incumbent upon the Pontiff who would impartially discharge the duties of the keeper of the conscience of man.

The Persico mission originated in the



attempt made by the English Government to enlist the authority of the Holy See on the side of "law and order" in Ireland. A very interesting chapter may some day be written concerning the visits paid by the Irish bishops to Rome before this date, but this need not be dwelt upon now. Suffice it to say that although the Pope was decidedly uneasy, owing to the representations of the English Catholics who through Cardinal Howard and Monsignor Stonor had always easy confidential means of access to his ear, he consoled himself by reflecting upon the assurances of Archbishop Walsh, the proved fidelity of the Irish episcopate, and the fact that Cardinal Manning by no means shared the alarm of the English Catholics. But after the failure of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's well-meant attempt to govern without coercion, by putting "pressure within the law" upon the landlords who refused to make the necessary reductions of rent, a concerted effort was made to secure the services of the Pope as Unionist Emergency Man in Ireland. After a good deal of secret intrigue, upon which it may be necessary hereafter to shed more light than would be at present desirable, very strong pressure was brought to bear upon the Pope. Lord Salisbury had now fairly entered upon this policy of coercion, and the opposition of the Irish priests and bishops was the chief obstacle which baffled his efforts to reach his goal. It was hinted not obscurely that as Job did not serve God for naught, so the English Government would handsomely requite the Holy See for any services it might render in muzzling the Irish priests. It is obvious that any English Government has many opportunities for doing a friendly turn to the Pope. The Empire of Britain stretches over all the continents and its shores are washed by all the seas. No other world dominion confronts the policy of Rome at so many points. Even leaving Ireland apart, the State which includes within its borders the Catholic *habitans* of Quebec, and in whose colonies See after See of the Church has been established within the lifetime of this generation, is a power with which it is important to be on good terms. Ever since the great convulsion of the sixteenth century, the two great world dominions of Rome and of Britain, the Empire of the Confessional and the Empire of the Sea, had confronted each other, either in open hostility or in silent antagonism. It was hinted to Leo XIII. that if he were disposed to do his part, the English Government was willing to abandon the policy of the cold shoulder and

enter into more or less intimate diplomatic relations with the Holy See.

It is not surprising that the Pope lent a willing ear to those faithful Catholics who implored him to seize an opportunity so unprecedented for bringing the Holy See into accord with the British Empire by accepting Lord Salisbury's overtures. Nothing seemed more natural to him than that he should endeavor to co-operate with the representatives of law and order. Himself the greatest of all authorities, he sympathized naturally with the authorities of Dublin Castle, and he had, on four previous occasions, made more or less feeble and ineffective efforts to restrain the priesthood in Ireland from participating in a revolutionary agitation, which in his opinion violated the moral law. The Holy Father was somewhat shy, but the bait was tempting. There was no question at first of securing the appointment of a Nuncio at the Court of St. James's, where none had been received for three hundred years, but much less than that would bring him perceptibly nearer to the goal of the temporal power. Mr. Gladstone, who has never purged himself from the offence of being the author of "Vaticanism," was known to be bitterly hostile to establishing diplomatic relations with the Vatican. Diplomatic relations only exist between temporal governments. Diplomacy is the intercourse of States. The Pope has no temporal authority. The Papal States no longer exist. How then can a representative be accredited to the Vatican without implying the existence of some shadowy temporal sovereignty in the Pope, which cannot coexist with the integrity of the Italian kingdom? So reasoned the Liberal leader, and it was clear nothing could be obtained from him. The bait was all the more tempting because the Pope knew that he could count upon no sympathy in his projects from Cardinal Manning. The Cardinal-Archbishop has never disguised his opinion that the appointment of a Nuncio would be disastrous to the best interests of the Church. The Pope, however, preoccupied in the cherished dream of regaining temporal sovereignty in Rome, held those scruples in light esteem, and after some coyness decided that the opportunity was too good to be lost. It was, however, necessary to proceed with caution. The memory of the smart rebuke given to the Holy See by the doubling of the popular subscription to Mr. Parnell, as soon as it was known that the Pope had condemned it, naturally made the Holy Father chary of courting such another reminder of the fact



that the Catholics of Ireland were still of the opinion of O'Connell, who said that while they took their religion from Rome they would as soon take their politics from Stamboul.

The Pope therefore decided to make a cautious move, and one to which no exception could be taken even by the most sensitive Irishman. Perplexed by conflicting representations, and grieved at the exacerbation of feeling consequent upon the introduction of the Coercion Bill, what was more natural than that he should despatch a special mission charged with the duty of personally investigating on the spot the facts of the case? So it was announced, with considerable flourish of trumpets, that Monsignor Persico was appointed as a Special Commissioner for the Holy See, to proceed to Ireland to inquire into and report upon the questions in dispute between the Irish and their rulers. Monsignor Persico was an Italian. He was a Capuchin friar, who held the titular Archbishopric of Damietta, and who had been employed on many delicate diplomatic missions by the Holy See in India, in Portugal, in Canada, and in South Carolina. His career illustrates at once the cosmopolitan nature of the Church, and the immense range of its activities. Excepting the British Empire there is nothing like it in the world. Most of Monsignor Persico's life had been spent under the shadow of the British flag. He had acted as Catholic chaplain to the British troops in India; had founded and directed a Catholic College at Darjeeling, and when the fabric of our Empire was temporarily submerged by the Mutiny, he was imprisoned by the Sepoys in the fortress of Agra. After his release he collected funds in Europe to repair the ruin wrought in Catholic edifices by the Mutiny, after which he became one of the most trusted envoys of the Holy See. Thirty years ago he came to London on a special mission, connected with the interests of the Church, the memory of which is faint and dim. In 1863 he was despatched to America to endeavor to allay the popular excitement that prevailed among the Catholics of South Carolina at the close of the war. He took part in the Council of the Vatican, after which he was sent on a mission to India, where he presided over the establishment of the hierarchy. After this little was heard of him outside the Roman world until his selection as Papal Envoy to Ireland in June, 1888.

Monsignor Persico commanded the confidence of the Pope, who selects as his favorites those who have rendered signal

service to the Church. He was perfectly at home in English, of which his Holiness does not understand one word. He had performed many diplomatic missions with success. What was more natural than that at this juncture the Pope should despatch him to Ireland to see what could be done? The fact that Monsignor Persico was not fitted personally to command the confidence of the Irish people does not seem to have occurred to the mind of the Pope. Such, however, was unfortunately the fact. There are antipathies of race which no amount of logic or of grace can overcome, and the Irish, from prelate to peasant, did not take kindly to the Italian friar. In personal appearance, the Envoy is not unlike an Italian peasant, somewhat stout, with a straggling gray beard, sly half-shut eyes, and a certain oily suavity which filled the Irish with distrust. "I would not trust him further than I could throw him," said one Irish member; and it is an open secret that at least one Irish Archbishop regarded him from the first with unconcealed distrust. As representative of the Pope, he was everywhere received with enthusiastic demonstrations of respect, but Monsignor Persico did not personally inspire the Irish hierarchy with confidence.

Strict instructions were given to Monsignor Persico to avoid any appearance of being in connivance with the English Government. So scrupulous, indeed, were the wirepullers, that Monsignor Persico was hurried to Dublin without being allowed to make any stay in London. By way of further keeping up the semblance of impartiality, Monsignor Gualdi was attached to the mission as Persico's secretary. Monsignor Gualdi, although an Italian like his chief, had enjoyed the advantage of having worked for many years among the Irish Catholics in London under the eye of Cardinal Manning. He understood Ireland, and was in such notorious sympathy with the popular aspirations that his selection as secretary was regarded as proof positive that the Persico mission was by no means intended to cover the muzzling of the clergy. But the lesson of the double-faced Janus has never been forgotten by the dwellers on the slopes of the Janiculum. Monsignor Gualdi accepted his mission in good faith. To quote his own simple words, spoken in Dublin, immediately after his arrival, he believed that "The Holy Father wants to learn the condition of the country just as if he were seeing it with his own eyes. He wants to do good to Ireland. He wants to be able to speak from facts collected

on the spot. He could not, of course, come over himself, and so he sent us." Such, at least, was the honest conviction of this honest priest. When events proved how much he had been misled, and Monsignor Persico found it necessary to disembarass himself of the assistance of a secretary who could not be bent to the service of the English Government, the good priest took it so much to heart that he took to his bed, and died, chiefly, it is asserted in Rome, from a broken heart.

Monsignor Gualdi was from the first not in the confidence of the Italian camarilla from which Monsignor Persico drew his instructions. He thought, for instance, that the Papal Envoy, after making a comprehensive study of the Irish question, would return to Rome and report to the Holy Father. That, however, was not the intention of the Pope. Monsignor Persico's mission was intended to be permanent. He was forbidden to return to Rome even when, like a true Italian, he pined for the blue sky, and fretted himself sick at the horror of wintering in these islands of the Northern Seas. Whether or not it was believed possible to develop the Papal mission into a regular Nunciature is buried in obscurity. What is known is that Monsignor Persico had positive orders to remain. If his health suffered in Ireland, he might be permitted to winter in England or Scotland, but outside of the three kingdoms he was not allowed to move. He might possibly have been here to this day but for the storm occasioned by the Rescript condemning the Plan of Campaign. But this is anticipating.

When Monsignor Persico first went to Ireland he kept up appearances. He went direct to Archbishop Walsh, the eulogist, and possibly, if the truth were known, one of the originators of the Plan of Campaign, and for a time all went well. The Archbishops and bishops were loud in their protestations of confidence in the sympathy of the Holy See for Ireland. But, after a time, a change came over the spirit of their dream. Monsignor Persico began to inspire distrust. He oscillated between the dinner-tables of landlords and the palaces of the bishops. He was on good terms with men engaged in administering an Act which the hierarchy, with almost unanimous voice, had branded as tyrannical and unjust. He certainly took no pains to establish confidential relations with the leaders of the popular party. He saw some of them in their turn, as he saw among others, on the other side, Richard Pigott, at that

time flourishing on the money paid by the *Times* for his forgeries. A Papal Envoy sees all men, and it was not surprising that Monsignor Persico, who in America was reputed to be a friend of Patrick Ford of the *Irish World*, should have rubbed shoulders with Richard Pigott of the *Times*.

By and by, when Monsignor Persico went southward to Limerick, suspicion deepened into distrust, and distrust soon developed into a rooted conviction that the sly Italian was playing them false. What he wrote to Rome has never been published. It is a secret of the Vatican. But judging from common rumor, he constructed his reports on the principle of sitting on the fence. The Irish had grievances—but they compromised their cause with violence. The English Government was too severe—but some of the priests were too keen politicians. Home Rule was a just demand with modifications—but the Plan of Campaign involved a breach of contract. All that summer the diplomatic dodgery went on, Monsignor Persico writing letters to the Vatican, and the Irish popular distrust of Persico deepening into detestation. But Monsignor Persico, not content with writing private representations to the Pope, attempted to do a little "pacification" off his own bat. Being in confidential relations with the authorities, they apprised him from time to time when they intended imprisoning a priest. He then communicated with the bishop, who through his vicar-general put the screw upon the priest to induce him to act with the utmost caution and moderation, and above all not to do anything that might bring him under the lash of the Coercion Act. Perhaps nothing could be more natural, but to the Irish mind nothing could be more detestable, than the Italian emissary of the Vicegerent of God making himself the cat's-paw and the go-between of the English oppressors. So the summer passed, and when the winter came, Monsignor Persico drew up his report and repaired to Bournemouth, to await the return of spring, when he was once more to cross the Irish Sea.

#### IV.

WHILE Monsignor Persico was preparing the ground in Ireland, his allies had not been idle. The Jubilee of her Majesty had afforded an opportunity for an interchange of courtesies between the Vatican and St. James's, which it was determined to exploit to the uttermost. The Pope had sent a special envoy to congratulate the Queen. What more natural and fitting



than that her Majesty's Ministers should send a special envoy to the Pope to return his compliments, and to see whether at the same time anything could be done to bring about those closer and more intimate relations upon which the Pope had set his heart? The motive of Persico's mission was pretty well understood at the Foreign Office, and it was deemed advisable that a serious effort should be made to bring matters to a head, and commit the Pope to a policy of repression in Ireland. It was under these circumstances and with such hopes that the mission of the Duke of Norfolk was decided on.

The Duke, who in England is a nonentity, is regarded at Rome with the respect due to a great noble who has preserved, in the midst of temptation, an unshaken loyalty to the Holy See. One Howard sat in the Sacred College, and the ducal head of the family had always been a welcome visitor at the Vatican. In the Councils of the Church, personal piety weighs for more than intellectual capacity, and the deficiencies of the Duke in one direction were more than compensated in another. All things considered, it would probably have been difficult to find a more acceptable go-between than the Duke. His task was comparatively simple. He had to intimate, in more or less guarded phrase, that her Majesty's Ministers were not indisposed to do a little business with the Holy See on the principle of *do ut des*. If the Pope could see his way to use his moral influence to restrain the Irish bishops and clergy within the limits marked out by the English Government, then, perhaps, the English Government might see their way to meet the cherished aspirations of the Holy See for the re-establishment of direct diplomatic relations between the Vatican and the Court of St. James's. The Liberal Government had for some time maintained, at a considerable economy of truth, a sort of unofficial representative at the Vatican in the person of Sir George Errington, and it was difficult to see what insuperable objection there could be to the accrediting of a British envoy on a regular footing. The Duke was further in a position to intimate that, besides the re-establishment of diplomatic relations, something might be done in the shape of a substantial subsidy and Government patronage for Catholic education in Ireland.

When the Duke of Norfolk arrived in Rome, he found the Pope distracted by conflicting sympathies. Leo XIII. had bestowed upon Ireland and Irish affairs much closer attention than many an English statesman.

Some years before he had told Archbishop Croke that he was as good an Irishman as himself, and that he sincerely wished well to his Irish children no one could doubt who ever met him. In conversations with Archbishop Walsh he had completely reassured that astute and somewhat *rusé* prelate as to the genuine sympathy with which he regarded the Irish cause. So notorious were his tendencies, that Cardinal Howard, being asked on one occasion by an Irishwoman whether the Pope would receive her, replied that there was no doubt of it, but that if she would say that she was a Home Ruler his Holiness would receive her with special favor. In this there is nothing surprising. Ireland is to the future of Catholicism what England has been to the Protestant world. Ireland has always been the Isle of the Saints, but few Englishmen understand that in the new world which is springing up around us the Irish are the missionary race. In a remarkable sermon which Bishop Vaughan preached many years ago in Rome, he brought out with extraordinary effect this too often unnoticed feature of the Irish character. But for the Irish the whole English-speaking world beyond the narrow limits of the Catholic caste in Great Britain would be almost exclusively Protestant. It is owing to Ireland—and to Ireland almost alone—that the Holy See is able to establish its bishoprics in every land where the English tongue is spoken, and to encompass the world with churches not reared in *partibus infidelium*, but in the midst of the household of faith. The Irish brogue is as universal as the English language, and wherever there is the brogue there also is the Mass.

In Rome there is the great ecclesiastical department of the Propaganda; but the real Congregation de Propaganda Fide upon which the Catholic Church must depend for maintaining its hold upon the coming time is the Irish race with its cradle and its priest. Leo XIII. must therefore feel intensely interested in the somewhat sombre fortunes of his missionary nation. But as he plaintively told Cardinal McCabe in 1882, "the condition of Ireland gives him more anxiety than comfort." Again and again during his pontificate he has addressed letters to the Irish hierarchy, in which it is easy to discern the uneasiness and uncertainty with which he addresses himself to the solution of this thorny problem. Not even to the successor of St. Peter is vouchsafed that divine illumination whereby the Irish question can be understood. However infallible may be the guidance vouchsafed

to the Supreme Pontiff in matters of faith and morals, in dealing with the complex political and social questions involved in the Irish question he is sometimes, like all the rest of us, but as a child groping in the dark. Like less exalted mortals, the Holy Father can only act upon information received, and although he may occasionally be infallibly inspired, he is never infallibly informed. So far as can be judged from the documents contained in "*De Rebus Hiberniæ nuperrima Apostolicæ sedis Acta*," he is ill at ease on the subject. He sees no light. He is dissatisfied with the existing condition of the country, but he had implicit confidence in Mr. Gladstone's Administration. Even when the Irish jails had been crammed with untried prisoners, and Mr. Gladstone was plunging from the Coercion Act of Mr. Forster to the Coercion Act of Sir W. Harcourt, the Pope did not hesitate to express his confidence that the statesmen who preside over the administration of Ireland would give satisfaction to the Irish when they demand what is just. He believed in the justice of those who ruled Ireland, "whose great experience is generally tempered with judgment." Hence he deprecated excited feelings, and exhorted the people to follow none but moderate and just counsels, to obey their bishops, and not to fail in the religious observance of their duty. He is earnestly anxious for the welfare of Ireland, but he adds that it is not lawful to disturb order on account of it. So little did he appreciate the realities of the situation, that, after exhorting the people to give the utmost heed to their bishops, he found himself compelled to launch a circular against the Parnell Testimonial, which was originated by Archbishop Croke and lavishly subscribed to by the people, because of the alacrity with which they followed the Papal advice to pay heed to their bishops. Beyond the issue of more or less ineffective exhortations to moderation, which fell idly upon the ears of men whose own bishops declared, with a far clearer insight into the necessities of the situation, that energetic action was sounder policy, the Pope did not venture upon any more drastic measures than to interdict the younger clergy from taking part in public meetings—an interdict which is practically a dead letter—and to condemn the Parnell Testimonial, with, as we have said, the immediate result of doubling the subscriptions.

So far, then, as the great experiment of restoring the authority of the mediæval Popes had gone, it had not been a signal success, even in the Isle of the Saints, the

closest Catholic preserve in the fold of the Church. In no country in the world are the laity as faithful and as zealous as in Ireland. Archbishop Croke was able to prove to the Pope that in his diocese ninety-four per cent of the adult population regularly communicated. Unlike the rest of Western Europe, the democratic movement in Ireland flows in Catholic channels. The bishops are the leaders of the people, the priests the tribunes of their flocks. Yet, the moment the Pope ventured to stray beyond the innocuous region of pious commonplace, he was sharply told that "the paternal mind of the Holy Father, watchful as it ever was for the good of Ireland, had been greatly misled;" and his own bishops in their pastorals did not hesitate to warn him "how easy it would be to persuade a jealous and credulous race like the Irish that the Pope had acted on erroneous, prejudiced, and one-sided information." The Irish are never slow to appeal *de Papa male informato ad melius informandum*: All this was not encouraging. But Leo XIII. is not a man who is easily dismayed, and on the solicitation of the Duke of Norfolk he once more addressed himself to the question whether, as supreme pastor of the faithful, he could not take a more effective share in the guidance and governance of the Irish people.

A very interesting picture might be drawn of the daily life of the Pope in his palace prison at a time when he thus gravely essayed to intervene in the affairs of a distant island, whose troubles have been the despair of British statesmanship for centuries. In some respects it must be admitted that the spectacle is almost ideal. Imagine a pure, good, and able man, of more than three-score years and ten, rising at six o'clock on any given morning, after a sleep as undisturbed as a child's, and setting about what is in his own honest conviction the discharge of his duty to God and His Church, by using his influence as the Vicegerent of the Almighty to allay the troubles of Ireland. His authority, to begin with, is almost absolutely untrammelled. When Alexander III. writes he uses M. De Giers as a pen. Cardinal Rampolla is equally the pen of Leo XIII. Around the Papal throne are Cardinals, and Archbishops, and dignitaries of great place; but in all the brilliant throng there is no one who exercises any controlling influence over the detached and lucid intellect of the Pope. Occasionally, earlier in his reign, they would endeavor to bring pressure to bear to induce him to adopt a policy to which he was disinclined.



"What you say," he would reply, "is very good, no doubt, but let it be done in a different way." And done it always was in Leo's way, until at last the Cardinals desisted from making fruitless suggestions. He is so supreme that, compared with the elevation which he occupies, Cardinals count for no more than deacons or even than acolytes. There are mutterings of discontent in the Congregations from men who once counted for something in the Church, but now count for nothing; but on the whole the Sacred College recognizes with loyalty and pride the commanding ability and authoritative confidence of its chief. The Pope therefore has a single mind, and he has an immense sense of his responsibility for the decisions at which he arrives. Every morning, before addressing himself to the direction of the affairs of this planet, he offers the sacrifice of the Mass, and then for *gratiorum actio* attends a second Mass, at which his chaplain is the celebrant. With a mind thus attuned to divine things, the Pope then begins his working day. A single glass of coffee, tea, or milk suffices to break his fast. After going through his papers, he begins to receive about nine. From that hour till one in the afternoon the throng of visitors never slackens. Secretaries, Ambassadors, Cardinals from the Congregation, distinguished strangers, bishops from afar, have audience in turn. There are twelve hundred bishops in the Catholic Church, and with all of them the Pope is in more or less constant personal relations. Nothing can be more gracious, more animated, or more sympathetic than the manner of the Pope. His eye, which when fixed in thought is deep and piercing, beams with kindness, and the severely rigid lines of his intellectual features relax with the pleasantest of smiles as he talks, using, as the case may be, either French, Latin (which he speaks with great purity and facility), or his own musical native tongue. After four or five hours spent in this way, he returns to his papers and his books until three, when he dines. His meal is frugal: a little soup, two courses of meat with vegetables, and dessert of fruit, with one glass of strong wine, suffice for his wants. After dinner he goes out for a drive or a walk in the gardens of the Vatican. In the evening he resumes his papers, and at night between nine and ten all the Papal household assemble for the Rosary, after which they retire to rest. But long after that hour the Cardinal State Secretary, Rampolla, or the Under-State Secretary, Moccenni, is often summoned to

the Papal apartments, where, by the light of the midnight lamp, Leo watches and thinks and prays for the welfare of the Church.

Here, if anywhere on the world's surface, it might be thought, was to be found a tribunal removed far from the distractions of this world, and fully aware of the enormous responsibility which presses with undivided force upon the supreme representative of the Christian conscience. Unfortunately, as the result proves, the tribunal, however ideal in theory, was as faulty in practice as if the successor of the Fisherman, sitting in judgment upon the case of Ireland, had been an actual fisherman of Yarmouth voting on Home Rule without the protection of the Corrupt Practices Act.

When a Pope is to be bribed, the *modus operandi* is more delicate than that practised in English elections by the Man in the Moon. The wirepullers of the Holy See appealed to no sordid motives, which would obviously be out of place in so august a Court. What they did was to use one of the Papal ideals to obscure the other. They nobbled the Vicar of Christ by exciting the expectations of the Italian Prince. No one looking at the sequence of events can doubt that, but for pressure of this sort, the Papal Rescript would never have been issued with such fatal precipitance. But the English Government, represented by the English Catholics, were in a hurry, and the Pope succumbed. Every consideration of duty and of expediency counselled delay. Monsignor Persico, who had been sent to Ireland on a special mission to enable the Holy Father to see things with his own eyes, had not reported. To ordinary mundane intelligence, it seems somewhat absurd to despatch a special commissioner to report upon the facts of a complex situation, and then to proceed to deliver judgment before you have had time to read your commissioner's report. A saving sense of humor would have saved the Pope from such a blunder. But, unfortunately, the very excellence of the motives of the Pope and his own strong sense of his supreme and divine position, seem to make him feel that he may without danger emancipate himself from the conditions which other men impose upon themselves as security against hasty and uninformed judgment. Monsignor Persico had written many letters, even if he had not drafted his final report. The Plan of Campaign had been before the world for more than eighteen months. If the Pope were to render any assistance worth paying

for, it must not be delayed. So Leo XIII. set himself to deliver judgment.

It is interesting to note how under such circumstances the Supreme Court of Christendom addresses itself to the consideration of the case before it. The organization of the Holy See is admitted universally to be such a masterpiece of human wisdom, that the faithful may be excused for seeing in it the inspiration of heaven. Unfortunately, in the present instance, its deliberations can hardly be said to be worthy of imitation. To begin with, an Italian, spurred into action by English pressure and English temptation, decides to adjudicate upon one of the most difficult questions concerning the life of a nation, whose existence has been little better than one long martyrdom at the hands of the English. Having so decided, the Pope, who has never been in Ireland, and who is incapable of speaking even one word of the language of the people, whose instincts are those of an authoritative ruler of a centralized organization, the mainstay of Governments and the bulwark of conservatism and order, sends for Cardinal Rampolla, also an Italian, and communicates to him his intention. A Committee is then constituted, composed either exclusively, or all but exclusively, of Italians, who have never been in Ireland and who are entirely out of touch with the solid realities of the situation, and to this Committee the subject is referred for consideration. When this Italian Committee meets in an Italian city, it communicates with the Italians, Simeoni and Jacobini, who are at the head of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide, and requests information. From this local branch of the Intelligence Department of the Holy See a mass of documents are got together, reports from bishops and the like, and they are all passed on to the Committee charged with the consideration of the question. That Committee after some more or less general discussion, according to the wont of such bodies, appoints one of its members, who like every one else is an Italian, to draw up a draft report, which after some further discussion is finally approved and sent on to the Pope. The Pope in his turn considers it apart, modifies it here and there, and finally issues it with his supreme authority, for the guidance of the Catholic Irish, who are taught from their infancy to regard him as their supreme and infallible guide in all matters of faith and morals.

That was the fashion in which the Rescript was brought out. It is in this way that the Vicegerent of Eternal Justice ex-

ercises his jurisdiction. From first to last there is no indication that one of these foreign priests took the trouble to inform himself at first hand of the facts on which he is called upon to pronounce judgment. During the conception of this extraordinary document, the Holy Father does not appear to have thought it worth while to communicate with his faithful bishops in Ireland, the most conspicuous of whom, Archbishop Walsh, had publicly committed himself to a defence of the Plan of Campaign. The result was what might have been anticipated. The Rescript condemning boycotting and the Plan of Campaign assumed as a postulate the existence of free contract between landlords and tenants in Ireland. Assuming that to exist which did not exist, its censure was nothing more than a shot fired in the air. *Bos locutus est*, and to as little purpose and with as little intelligence as is common to the species. It was *abrutum fulmen* which irritated without overawing, and alarmed without convincing those to whom it was addressed.

In Ireland the Rescript was received with an angry outburst of indignation which found a convenient whipping-boy in the Papal Envoy. Ever since the appearance of that sinister and ill-omened document, Monsignor Persico has been one of the most detested of living men. "And who is that?" said a recent distinguished visitor to Rome, as in the midst of a throng of ecclesiastics he saw a dignitary clad in the brown garb of a Capuchin friar. "Oh," said his cicerone, "that is Monsignor Persico." "The saints preserve us," was the reply; and the speaker, with horror and alarm on his features, crossed himself as diligently as if the shadow of the Evil One had fallen across his path. So vehement was the chorus of denunciation that Monsignor Persico was alarmed for his own safety. Incredible as it may appear to those who know how foreign such a crime is to the Catholic Irish, it is actually the fact that he believed and said that his life was in danger. It was with a feeling of profound relief that he received permission to return to Rome, where he is now looking after the Copts, and discharging the other duties which belong to the Secretariat of the Oriental rites to which he was promoted some months after his return.

Never for many years has there been such a commotion as was excited by the Rescript. The bishops of Ireland, with one exception, omitted to publish it to their flocks. This recalcitrance excited the liveliest displeasure in the Vatican. Monsignor Mocenni, the



Under-State Secretary, an Italian who had much experience of Vienna, but who regards Ireland from the conventional standpoint of ecclesiastical discipline, was scandalized. "They are revolutionaries," he exclaimed; "all revolutionaries—the whole people,—how dare they refuse to publish the Rescript in Ireland?" They did dare, and after a while they were able to convince the Holy Father that they were wiser in their disobedience than he was in his Rescript. The Pope was sincerely alarmed by the storm which he had excited. All Ireland seemed to be up in arms, and the most faithful Catholics were those who took the lead in denouncing the Rescript. To add to the chagrin and disappointment of the well-meaning but injudicious Pope, the only voices raised in approval were those of the habitual enemies of himself and his people, who hardly cared to conceal the note of mockery and exultation with which they hailed the discomfiture of the Irish Catholics. To delight the enemies of the faith and to fill the faithful with confusion and dismay was not exactly the end which the Pope had set before himself when with unwise precipitance he plunged into the Irish bog. Fortunately he was wise enough and bold enough to see his mistake and to endeavor to reverse it. An apologetic explanation was published. All negotiations with the Duke of Norfolk were abruptly broken off. The Duke suddenly returned to England from Italy without having the audience which had been arranged. Monsignor Persico was recalled, and since that date the Holy See has suspended all further attempts to interfere in Irish affairs.

The formula under which this change of policy is concealed is a decision that before any fresh step is taken, the Irish and American bishops, and, if possible, those of Australia also, shall be consulted—a resolution of vast and far-reaching significance which it is satisfactory to have stated on indubitable authority.

## V.

THE successor of the Fisherman will have learned an invaluable lesson if in future he refuses, being in Italy, to interfere with the man at the helm in Ireland. St. Peter would never have lived to be an apostle and the first Bishop of Rome, if, when the storm arose on the Galilean lake, he had been compelled to steer his craft in obedience to orders shouted to him from men on the shore. At present Monsignor Persico has to bear the brunt of the blame, for the

Church never hesitates to sacrifice its instruments in order to protect its head. But in the interests of truth, it is necessary to say quite clearly that it is the Pope and not Monsignor Persico who must bear the blame for the recent peril into which the Church has been plunged in Ireland. Monsignor Persico's lips are closed for the present, and he cannot make any reply to the hurricane of abuse with which he has been overwhelmed. Should the time come when he can be heard in his own defence, the world and the Church will be surprised indeed.

It is therefore all the more incumbent upon those who know the facts as they are known in Rome to do an act of tardy justice to Monsignor Persico, who so far from deserving the censure so freely heaped upon him, may fairly claim to have seen the rock upon which the Holy Father steered, and to have urged him, unfortunately in vain, to adopt an altogether different course to that which he persisted in pursuing.

This is a very grave statement, which is not made without positive knowledge at first hand of the facts. In justice to Monsignor Persico, it should be known in Ireland—

1. That so far from the Rescript having been drawn up in accordance with his recommendations, there were few men in all Ireland more astonished, and it may be added dismayed, than was Monsignor Persico on the receipt of that fateful document. He was not consulted about it while it was in process of elaboration, he did not recommend that it should be issued, and the first intimation which he received that such a momentous step was to be taken was his receipt in common with the Irish bishops of the text of the Rescript.

2. That not only did Monsignor Persico not advise the publication of the Rescript, but in his reports, which he forwarded to the Vatican for the information of the Holy Father, he expressly and urgently deprecated any such precipitance, and implored the Pope to do nothing whatever in Ireland until he had summoned the Archbishops and one bishop from every province in Ireland to Rome, and had gone into all the questions of fact and of principle with those who were most competent to advise.

3. That when the Pope, in his letter of June 24th, 1888, defending his Rescript, told the Irish bishops that his sources of information were trustworthy, and that he could not be justly accused of having given judgment in a case with which he was insufficiently acquainted, because he had sent Monsignor Persico "with the commission to use the greatest diligence in ascertaining

the truth and to make a faithful report to us," he seems to have implied that his Rescript was based upon the report of Monsignor Persico. Although the Pope may have read the earlier letters of his Envoy, the contrast between Monsignor Persico's final advice and the Pope's action seems to indicate that his *Relazione* had not even been perused by the Pope before he launched the Rescript which created so much heart-burning in Ireland.

4. That Monsignor Persico, so far from desiring to make the Church the tool of the English Government, declared throughout that it was fatal to the influence of the Holy See in Ireland that the Pope's action should be in any way suspected to be prompted by England. He had considerable experience in negotiating with Catholic governments, and his conviction was very strong that the expectations of the Pope of gain from diplomatic relations with England were mistaken. They would not strengthen, and they might easily weaken, the authority of the Church. The hierarchy of Ireland, he maintained, were the true and proper channels through whom all communications should take place between the Pope and the Irish people.

These statements are not made without a full sense of the grave responsibility attaching to their publication. They are capable of conclusive demonstration. The Pope has only to ask Cardinal Rampolla to bring him Monsignor Persico's *Relazione*, to note the date on which that report was read by the Pope, to compare that date with the date of the Rescript, and then to compare the recommendations of Monsignor Persico with the statements made above. It is impossible, of course, for any one else to verify the accuracy of what will no doubt be regarded in Ireland as an astounding and almost incredible revelation, but the appeal may be made without hesitation to Rome. The Pope, the Cardinal State Secretary, and the Archbishop of Damietta know the facts, and they know that they are substantially as herein stated. This being so, is it not about time that a more charitable judgment of Monsignor Persico began to prevail in Ireland?

Much more important, however, than the rehabilitation of the Archbishop of Damietta, is the lesson which this story teaches as to the perils which encompass the Church when the Sovereign Pontiff, the successor of the Prince of the Apostles, and the Vicar upon earth of our Lord Himself, can thus set at defiance the ordinary rules of statesmanship. It is not enough to have your

head in the clouds. You must have your feet firmly planted upon solid facts.

The Pope's ideal of embodying the voice of the Christian conscience is an admirable one; but it requires omniscience for its realization. If he would essay to prescribe for the moral and spiritual ailments of mankind, the first condition is a careful diagnosis of the state of his patient. It does not do to send "a man of tried prudence and discretion" to report upon a case, and then to prescribe without waiting to read his report. No amount of respect due to the holiness of his office, or the excellence of his intentions, can prevent the Pope making grievous mistakes prejudicial to his own authority if he ventures to pronounce judgment upon subjects which he does not fully understand, without taking the advice of those who are on the spot, and whose authority he is always exhorting the faithful to obey.

The root of the difficulty seems to lie in the extent to which the Catholic Church has been Italianized and centralized. If the Pope is to fulfil his greater ideal he will have to shake himself free from the influences of the Vatican. The atmosphere of the place, the traditions and associations which cling to its very walls, and the all-pervading presence of the Italian Cardinals and great officials, render it impossible for him to rise to the height of his great conception of his rôle as the mouthpiece of the conscience of universal Christendom which speaks with the voice of God. Until he has definitely rid himself of the desire to re-establish a temporal authority in a second-rate European city, that minor and earthly ambition will continually obscure his higher and brighter ideal, and lead him into devious courses which will impair his influence even in the Catholic world. Nor is it only in the distraction afforded by the petty anxieties connected with the dream of reviving his sovereignty in the States of the Church that the Italianization of the Holy See works evil. The autocratic associations of the Cæsars still haunt the Imperial city. The idea of centralization is one of the most inveterate of the moral miasmas of Rome. Of course if the Pope could claim special divine revelation affording him infallible guidance both as to the facts and as to the judgment to be pronounced on those facts, there could be no more to be said. But as not even the most extravagant infallibilist ventures to make such a claim, the Pope will find, like other great secular governments, that decentralization is the condition of efficiency and even of existence. Home



Rule is the key to the solution of other problems than those of the British Empire. The Pope, no doubt, will have his uses even when the affairs of each province of the Catholic world are left chiefly to the guidance of the local hierarchy. But the allowance of a larger liberty to the local churches in all matters social and political is the indispensable condition of any intelligent direction of the moral force of Catholicism to the solution of the difficulties and to the satisfaction of the wants of the human race.

All these considerations point in one and the same direction, and they are powerfully reinforced by the most conspicuous political phenomenon of our day. We stand at the dawn of a new epoch which, from the point of view of universal history, is quite as momentous as that in which the Northern tribes broke in upon and destroyed the fabric of the moribund Empire of Rome. It was the supreme merit of the Catholic Church that, amid the crash of the earlier world, it recognized with a sure prevision that the past was gone irrevocably, and that the future lay with the fierce warriors from the fastnesses and forests of the North. It remains to be seen whether the Church will be as quick to discern the salient feature of the great transformation through which the world is passing to-day. It is a revolution vaster and more rapid than that which founded the modern European world on the wreck and ruin of the Roman Empire. The world is passing into the hands of the English-speaking races. Already the English tongue is becoming the *lingua franca* of the planet. Already the territories over which the laws are made and justice administered in the language of Shakespeare and of Bacon exceed in wealth, in extent, in the number of their populations, and in the limitless latent possibilities of their development, all other lands ruled by all other nations of the earth. In a hundred years, unless the progress of this marvelous transformation is suddenly checked in some manner as yet inconceivable, the English speakers will outnumber all the men of other tongues in the world. Italian, Spanish, and French will be but local dialects of as little importance, except for literature, as Erse and Welsh. English ideas, English laws, English civilization, are becoming as universal as the English speech. Alone among the races the English have escaped the curse of universal military service. Alone among the nations they have learned to combine liberty and law, and to preserve an empire by the timely concession of local

self-government. Whether we welcome or whether we deplore the prospect, the fact is unmistakeable—the future of the world is English.

What, then, is to be the attitude of the Holy See in face of this strange remaking of the world? Upon the answer to that question depends the future of the Church. If she still aspires to exercise her beneficent dominion over the new and the coming world, she will follow the example of the great Popes who created Europe out of the chaos of barbarian invasion. She will no more seek to restore Papal sovereignty in the capital of Italy, than a thousand years ago she sought to revive the proconsuls of the Empire or to restore the Cæsars. Let the dead past bury its dead. Rome, once the world's centre, is now a mere provincial town, in an out-of-the-way corner of a small inland sea. The headquarters of the Church in the days when she was a living reality, gravitated by a natural law to the centre of Empire. If she is still to be a living reality, presiding over the development of our civilization and mothering the children of men, then she will be true to the law of her being and establish the seat of her sovereign Pontiff in the centre where sovereignty resides. Rome is of the old world, archaic, moribund, and passing away. The centre, the capital, and the mother city of the new world which Catholicism must conquer or perish, is not to be found on the banks of the Tiber, but on the Thames.

Nor is it only on political, geographical, and ethnological grounds that the Papacy must be Occidentalized—Anglicized or Americanized. The whole lesson of the Persico incident, and of many another incident like it, is that the more sedulously the Pope endeavors to fulfil his high mission, the more necessary is it that he should avail himself of those plain and simple principles of common sense applied to the art of government which are the pre-eminent endowment of the English-speaking world. These principles are those of liberty and local self-government. They will never get a fair chance of being worked into the bones and marrow of the Catholic Church until we have a Pope who thinks English.

So clearly does this appear that after long and careful survey of the situation at Rome and throughout the world, it does not seem presumptuous to conclude this paper with a prophecy. It may be that the Church of Rome has played her part in the affairs of men and that in the new English-speaking era, on the threshold of which mankind is

standing, there may be no more than a niche in a Roman museum for the successor of Hildebrand. In that case, whether the Pope stays in Rome or goes to Seville or Innsbruck or Minorca does not much matter. But, if there be any real substance of truth in the Pope's belief that the Catholic Church is the chosen instrument whereby Infinite Wisdom inspired by Eternal Love works out the salvation of the world, then as certainly as it was necessary for a persecution to arise to scatter the first Christians from Jerusalem so that they might carry the seed of the faith over the Roman world, not less certainly shall we see in a few years, or even it may be a few

months, the breaking of a storm which will compel the Pope to fly from the Eternal City—never to return. And in that hour when those who hate the Church fill the air with insult and exultation, and when those who love her more in her accidents than in her essence are abased to the dust with humiliation and shame, then to the eye of faith the enforced hegira of the Pope from the Latin to the English world will be regarded as the supreme affirmation of the providential mission of the Church—a new divine commission for her to undertake on a wider basis the great task of rebuilding the City of God.

### MISSION WORK AMONG THE LEPERS.

From *The New York Observer*.

THE investigation of the facts in the case leads to the conclusion that some very serious misrepresentations have been made by the admirers of the late Father Damien in their eulogies on that truly noble man. It is so seldom that any thoroughly consecrated worker receives his due meed of praise, that but for injustice to others it might be well enough to allow the statements made about his work to remain uncontradicted. In the interests of truth and justice this cannot be. The statements concerning Father Damien require very serious modification. A plain exposure of the absurdity of some of the claims urged on behalf of this priest is made by the *Honolulu Friend*. That journal regards as undoubted the evidence that Father Damien "gave himself with unreserved self-sacrifice to promote the well-being of the lepers at the Molokai settlement, and that in this service he contracted the malady as he expected to do." Again, it is cheerfully admitted that "he appears to have been genuinely compassionate and humane, untiring in labor and never sparing himself." But far more than all this has been claimed for him. The leper settlement, which he made the field of his self-sacrificing labors, is represented as having been "abandoned to disorder and neglect" until his arrival in 1874 secured amelioration. This on the authority of Auther Ballantyne, in a contribution to *Longman's Magazine*. To this article, it appears, must be attributed a large proportion of the exaggerated statements made by other journals. Thus we find the New

York *Tribune*, for instance, saying: "The brutal indifference of the Hawaiian Government had thrust these poor creatures away upon a barren peninsula. . . . Damien found them a colony of men and women forgetting God and hating men, utterly wretched in body and mind, and abandoned in their desperation to every form of wickedness. . . . His labors transformed this nest of disease-stricken savages into a Christian community."

One of our religious contemporaries in New York makes these statements: "Thirteen years ago these villages were the homes of indescribable misery. The Government had adopted the theory that the lepers could sustain themselves. . . . The miserable huts, huddled together, filled with wretchedness and debauchery, which greeted him as he landed in 1873, have now been supplanted (through his efforts) by groups of neat cottages. Father Damien took up first the question of sufficient food, and as a result of his importunities the Hawaiian Government arranged that food supplies should be sent at regular intervals to the island. . . . Through his representations and under his personal direction, the Government has comfortably housed the colony, Father Damien himself having built many of the houses."

#### OFFICIAL ACCOUNTS.

The erroneousness of these assertions as to the miseries of Molokai before the days of Damien is manifest when we read what the Biennial Report of the Board of Health,



addressed to the Hawaiian Legislature, and dated April 1st, 1874, has to say on the subject. We quote the *Friend*: "This report is signed by Hon. H. A. Widemann, then President of the Board of Health, a gentleman of high standing, a Catholic, a vigorous critic of administrative faults, and his party having just come into office, quite at liberty to denounce any neglect of the late Protestant Minister of Interior, E. O. Hall. Mr. Widemann asserts that 'in material point of view these people are better off on Molokai than most people of these islands, and also better off, with few exceptions, than they ever were in their own homes.' A 'large number of *kuleanas*, with numerous good houses' had recently been purchased to meet the wants of the increasing population. (*Kuleanas* are small private pieces of land.) Six thousand feet of water pipe had been laid. 'Mr. W. P. Ragsdale, who some months ago gave a remarkable example of self-sacrifice in going of his own accord to Molokai, is the present superintendent of the asylum. A more active and efficient man could hardly be found.' The lepers 'have been made in all respects as comfortable as possible.' All this was before Damien had gone to the settlement."

Two years previous to that (1872) the report of Dr. F. W. Hutchinson says: "The food ration is a large one, and exceeds that supplied to the soldiers of the best supplied European and American armies. . . . The Board can fairly assert that these people are better supplied than they ever were in their own homes. A proof of the assertion may be found in the fact that many of the people living at the landing place at Kalaupapa have been anxious to make themselves lepers. . . . We repeat again that these people are well taken care of, and are not unhappy."

The *Friend* continues: "The tone of defence of this report betokens the fact that the treatment of the lepers was then, as always, the subject of jealous scrutiny by the Hawaiian public. . . . This report of 1872 describes the commodious house of the keeper, two hospitals for the sick, and a separate house for those lepers needing special care. There are described 'separate houses built for boys and girls, with a special building for a school-room,' the teacher being a leper. 'A number of milch cows furnish plenty of milk' for the patients, 'and the food is prepared by a Chinese cook'."

"A little distance from this central place, nearer the seaside, a little church has been built, where every Sunday a native

minister, a leper himself, holds a service. . . . It is well attended by the poor people, for whose benefit it was erected."

This last testimony of Dr. Hutchinson will have more force with those who remember how entirely out of sympathy he was with the Protestant missionaries.

#### CALUMNIES DISPROVED.

Our Honolulu contemporary thus proceeds to deal with "the calumnies as to the religious and moral condition of Molokai and the leper settlement at the date of Damien's arrival." Mr. Ballantyne says: "Though the other Hawaiian Islands had abolished idolatry and adopted Christianity, in Molokai—where there was no missionary, no priest—the old paganism, with all its horrible consequences, reigned supreme." This seems really too absurd for serious notice. Molokai was, in many respects, the most thoroughly and successfully worked missionary field in the group. Mr. and Mrs. Hitchcock were at the head of the work from 1832 to 1857. They were peculiarly devoted and efficient, and had excellent missionaries associated with them. There were no traders in their field, and their influence was less impeded than on the other islands. Nearly every man and woman on the island came to own their powerful moral and spiritual sway. Father Hitchcock was a first-class example of a devoted, hard-working missionary hero, whom the people both loved and feared, and we had plenty more like him. About the time of his death the count showed an excess of births over deaths on Molokai. This was the one solitary instance of the kind in this kingdom. It evinced the superior moral condition of that island. After this, for eleven years, Rev. A. O. Forbes carried on the work ably and devotedly, periodically visiting and ministering to the lepers after they came there in 1865, organizing the Siloam church, and installing their first pastor.

"A considerable proportion of the lepers were members of Protestant churches, many deacons, and some ministers. Their spiritual wants were well supplied by church and Sabbath schools, and have always been the object of solicitous care from the other churches and the Hawaiian Board. And now comes this Mr. Ballantyne and tells the world that Molokai was a heathen island, which Father Damien Christianized!"

Mr. Ballantyne may have been misled by Catholic Mission statistics, which would have shown Molokai to have been without church or priest of their persuasion. Father

Hitchcock's supremacy left them no foothold. Still we think that good Bishop Maigret would hardly have made return of Molokai as a "Pagan" island, however far from salvation he may have reckoned us Protestants.

Why Bishop Maigret left his Catholic people at Kalawao for so many years destitute of spiritual care, we do not know. So neglected, they became the source of much of the moral disorder that existed at Kalau-papa among the idle lepers in spite of church and magistrate. Father Damien did a worthy and noble thing to volunteer in 1873 to serve them. He did a great good by bringing the neglected Catholic minority under spiritual direction and control. He also worked zealously for their bodily needs. In this respect his services may doubtless be regarded as of indispensable value. We don't know of any evidence that Damien's usefulness for some years extended beyond what he did for the Catholic minority. All good missionaries, as a rule, combine a variety of material labors with spiritual; Damien did the same, and seems to have done his work zealously and faithfully according to his ability.

A correspondent of the San Francisco *Occident* claims that he has often heard the reports of the Siloam church of the leper settlement to the Presbytery of Mani, and has known of three Hawaiian ordained ministers living amongst and laboring for the lepers.

#### CLAIMS DISPUTED.

It is quite evident that the claim that Father Damien revolutionized and Christianized the leper settlement of Molokai is very wide of the truth. In this connection it is worthy of note that there are facts to show that in his work, good as it was, he received more aid and support from Protestants than from Catholics. Thus a correspondent of the Boston *Watchman* tells us that "The first substantial help to Father Damien was from the Protestants, and last year his work appealed to the heart of an English Church rector, who collected and sent to him more than a thousand pounds sterling, which was in addition to the ordinary aid of the Hawaiian Government." This correspondent adds: "Which now thinkest thou was neighbor to this devoted priest? Let the Church which now canonizes him answer for all those years when it left him to the tender mercies of those not in sympathy with the hierarchy, and let them read what our Lord says of 'building and garnishing the tombs of the prophets.'

We may add that when the 'Sisters of St. Francis,' from Syracuse, N. Y., went there to nurse the lepers, it was a Congregational banker of Honolulu who built and furnished the cottages for them to live in, and, so far as we know, the rich Catholics would have left them to the same real or imaginary want that Father Damien suffered, without a thought of care for them till they too had died of this horrible disease. When Father Damien, a year ago, wrote to Rev. Hugh Chapman, of England, to thank him for his generous collection, and asked him to mention their further wants to Cardinal Newman, he little thought that the dignitaries of the 'Catholic' Church were too busy tithing the mint, anise, and cumin of rites, ceremonies, and dogmas, to be concerned much about the miseries and wants of a poor priest in the islands of the Pacific. And so he was left to the care of a Government whose sharpest trials in its early days had come from French priestly intrigue and interference, and to Christian men and women in Hawaii and abroad, who could for the time forget that 'the Church' still persecutes where it has power, and curses those who are taking away that power and compelling it to observe outwardly the amenities which it never willingly shows to those who dispute its arrogant pretensions to supremacy over the hearts and consciences of men."

#### OTHER HEROES.

It will already have been seen that Father Damien's record of heroism and self-sacrifice is not an isolated one. It should be remembered that for nearly seventy years the Moravian Church has identified itself with similar service. Beginning with occasional visits to Christian Hottentots who had been removed from the Moravian settlements in South Africa to the temporary asylum in the valley of Hemel en Aarde, Moravian missionaries did not neglect the other afflicted inmates. In 1822, the British Government placed the institution in charge of the Moravian Church. "For seven years," says the *Moravian*, the organ in this country of the denomination, "Brother Leitner, for ten years Brother Tietz, for four years Brother Fritsch, for three years Brother Lehman, and their respective wives, devoted themselves to their self-denying and repulsive labors, caring both for the bodily and spiritual needs of the lepers. In 1846 the Government removed the establishment to Robben Island, near the entrance to Table Bay, seven miles from Cape Town, and at the earnest request of the lepers, our mis-



sionaries were finally permitted to accompany them. From this time until 1867, when the Colonial Government appointed a chaplain of the English Church, our brethren ministered unto them in spiritual things, Brother Lehman being succeeded by Brother Stolze for four years, and the Brethren Wedeman and Küster, each for eight years, while from 1861 to his being called home to eternal rest, on May 27th, 1866, Brother John Taylor devoted himself to the schools. But when this door of usefulness was closed, another was opened, and that at Jerusalem, in Palestine; and Brother and Sister Tappe, who had been missionaries to the Esquimaux, in Labrador, for thirteen years, arrived at Jerusalem, on May 21st, 1867, and took charge of the work. Long and faithfully they worked, assisted by deaconesses from our Church institutions at Guadenfeld and Niesky, until advancing years and physical infirmity compelled them to retire in May, 1884. Since that time Brother F. Müller, who had been Brother Tappe's assistant for a short time, has had full charge of the work. A noteworthy fact in connection with this mission is that which occurred in 1887. An entire breakdown in the health of the nurses and other seemingly adverse circumstances, led the Directing Board of the Church to call for volunteers in this arduous and self-denying service, and the appeal was at once answered by offers from ten German and two English sisters. Three of these volunteers were gratefully selected, and at once started on their errand of mercy, reaching Jerusalem in time to be present at the dedicatory services of the new Leper Home, built in a vineyard on an eminence which commands the highway from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, at a short distance from the city gates. As far as we are informed none of our missionaries ever contracted the dread disease, but none the less heroic is it to bear the heavy cross, which the daily care of lepers in every stage of a loathsome and incurable disease must impose."

#### MR. BAILEY'S MISSION WORK.

In 1874 Mr. W. C. Bailey, a missionary of the Church of Scotland, in conjunction with several Dublin friends, began work in behalf of the 135,000 lepers of India. The society which he established seeks to operate as an auxiliary to existing missionary agencies. It makes grants for the building of leper asylums, and in many instances provides for the support of lepers, but its principal work is that of furnishing missionaries of the various societies with the

means for such special work as they may feel disposed to undertake among the afflicted class. Such work is now carried on at eighteen different points throughout India, in connection with the Church Missionary Society, the London Missionary Society, the Church of Scotland Foreign Missionary Committee, the Wesleyan Mission, the Baptist Missionary Society, Gossner's Evangelical Mission, the American Presbyterian Mission, the American Methodist Episcopal Mission, and the American Baptist Missionary Union. In a letter to the *Christian Leader*, of Glasgow, dated July 13th, 1889, Mr. Bailey makes an appeal for a new department of his work—that of rescuing the untainted children of lepers. He says: "We are hoping to open many homes for these little ones if the Lord will. It takes about £50 to build a small home, and £4 supports a child." He quotes the following from a letter from the Rev. J. J. Lucas, of Allahabad: "There is no cure, and very little can be done even to relieve suffering. One of the saddest sights is to see the little children of the lepers playing about all unconscious of the dreadful years coming on them. The parents come to the asylum with the children, as a rule, and it is a hard question to decide what to do with these children."

Father Damien has passed to his reward. He has received a crown whose lustre cannot fade away. All honor to his memory. Not to him alone, however, must our thoughts turn, when we seek to instance cases of heroism and marvellous self-sacrifice, as evidenced by a life devoted to the welfare, social and spiritual, of those terrible unfortunates who bear the loathsome name of lepers.

#### THE BAPTIST WORK IN SWEDEN.

BY REV. P. A. NORDELL, D.D.

From *The Examiner*, New York.

PROVIDENTIALLY I am permitted to spend a few weeks this summer in the suburbs of Stockholm. The city and vicinity are famous for the exquisite charm of the natural scenery. The straits, extending westward toward Lake Maclaren, and eastward toward the Baltic, contain, literally, thousands of islands rising here in graceful slopes, and there almost precipitously from the dark blue depths of the water. But whether large or small, their ruggedness is concealed beneath thick carpets of moss and lichen,

and overshadowed by dense growths of birch and pine. The red-tiled roofs of handsome villas contrast sharply with the sombre green of the groves around them. Their presence at almost every available beach proclaims the universal eagerness to escape from the city after the long, dark winters, and to enjoy the fragrance of the country and the warm sunshine that lingers even at midnight in a golden, sleep-dispelling twilight. Notwithstanding this exodus from the city, the churches maintain their usual services, with the exception of the Sunday-school.

Last Monday evening I chanced to be in the city, and was invited to attend the weekly business-meeting of one of our most recently organized churches. It does not possess a house of worship, but meets in a hall seating about two hundred and fifty. The furniture is plain, but included a baptistery. Though the rain had poured down incessantly through the afternoon and evening, there were nearly sixty persons present, all adults, and two thirds of the number males. This seemed a remarkable contrast with American churches, where it is difficult to get a quorum. Here, business meetings are held every week, and are on the average better attended than the prayer-meetings of the church. After half an hour spent in devotional exercises, the business of the evening was transacted. Being then introduced to the pastor, I was by him introduced to his people as a pastor of a sister church in America, to whom all present extended a most cordial welcome by rising. Thanking them for their unexpected kindness, I related in a few words the deep interest American Baptists have always cherished toward their brethren in Sweden, and how we have looked upon the work here as yielding exceptionally large and blessed results. From the churches in America I extended greetings. The pastor, who speaks English, as do almost half the people one meets, thereupon informed me that this congregation was a direct result of means contributed by the Missionary Union, and that for this help, without which such results might not have been attained, they were profoundly grateful to God and to the American churches. By an enthusiastic rising vote, this church, as a child of the American Baptist Missionary Union, extended its greetings to the churches on the other side of the Atlantic, and especially to the one at New London, which I have the joy of serving. The spirit of the meeting was excellent. The business was transacted with the utmost order, promptness, and harmony. In so far as this meeting

may be taken as a type of those in other churches, it indicated a deep, personal interest on the part of all the members in the secular and religious affairs of the body, and this may fairly be considered one of the first requisites for extended and permanent success; at least, it is so regarded here.

#### BAPTIST GROWTH IN SWEDEN.

This church is one of 497 included in the recently published statistics for 1888. During that year twenty-three new churches were organized. Of the entire number, 210 owned houses of worship. There were 521 preachers, some of whom, however, were debarred by circumstances from devoting their whole time to the work of the ministry. The churches included a total membership of 32,305, of whom 2393 had been added by baptism. The Sunday-schools contained 32,767 pupils and 2816 teachers. Contributions for all purposes amounted to 312,311 kronor, or about \$83,256. In addition to this amount some \$6000 a year are received from the Missionary Union in Boston, a part of which is employed in assisting weak churches to sustain pastors, but the larger part is used in carrying on the work of the Bethel Seminary in Stockholm, which gave instruction last year to twenty-seven young men preparing for the ministry. The significance of these figures lies in the fact that this growth has been attained in a comparatively short time. About forty years ago there was not a Baptist in Sweden. One who had embraced their views abroad, and had returned to his native land, was promptly banished from the country in the delusive hope of nipping the evil in the bud.

#### THE PRESENT SITUATION.

In relation to the State church the Baptists may be said to enjoy toleration rather than religious liberty. The law still regards them as members of the State church, for whose support they are taxed in the same manner as other citizens. They still rest under many exasperating civil and religious disabilities. There is, however, a rapid growth of a more liberal spirit, so that unprejudiced observers, even among the staunch adherents of the State church, take no pains to conceal the conviction that complete religious liberty and the disestablishment of the Lutheran Church, though not immediately at hand, are ultimately inevitable.

The churches are not distracted by diversity in doctrinal views. The strict denominational practices prevalent in America are



rigidly cherished here. A constant struggle has been maintained against the numerous and influential Free Church, which in point of doctrine corresponds very closely with the Andover wing of American Congregationalism, but is marked by a far more enthusiastic religious activity. The Baptists have apparently lost largely, not only among the common people, but among those of social position and wealth, by uncompromising loyalty to their distinguishing principles. There is, for instance, in Stockholm a splendid church edifice, built by the munificence of a Baptist layman, but the church worshipping there, though holding on the whole stricter views than Spurgeon's church in London, is not included in the Stockholm Association, nor reckoned as belonging to the denomination. Some of these losses may possibly have been avoided by a little tact without the surrender of principles. Oil is a better lubricant than sand.

The high degree of spiritual life, of warmth, and of real earnestness, impresses a stranger very favorably. The general interest in Christian work and in the spread of the Gospel is deep and genuine, and compares very favorably with that in America. On the contrary, Christianity stands much higher ethically there than here. A deplorable immorality pervades the masses of the city population. In the remoter country districts domestic habits among the common people are such as to blunt if not to destroy the keen and delicate moral sense characteristic of American society. This low moral tone, confined largely to the masses, intrudes sadly into the life of the Church, since it is largely from the laboring masses that the churches draw their membership, and it is not possible to eradicate from the converts in a moment the conceptions and habits of a lifetime. The work of elevation is slow, because of the absence from the community at large of a cultivated moral sense which denounces vice. Though the churches strive by prompt discipline to keep their garments unspotted by this sin, there is sometimes a disposition to deal too leniently with it. This much, however, may truthfully be said, that, whereas the moral tone of society at large is not improving, there is within the churches a perceptible elevation year by year.

An adequate supply of well-trained and experienced pastors is an immediate and pressing need. The older preachers, who have rendered most praiseworthy services, are men whose large experience, in some measure, compensates for the lack of special intellectual discipline. But these brethren

are passing away, new churches are rapidly multiplying, and many of the younger ministers emigrate to America, to supply Swedish churches in the West. The seminary in Stockholm seeks to meet this need as far as lies in its power. But no seminary can supply experience. Young men who pass from a course of study in the brilliant life of the capital to country parishes, where the average culture is far from being as great as among the farmers in America, find it difficult to adjust themselves wisely to existing conditions, and considerable friction results. This state of things is perhaps incidental to the newness and immaturity of the work, and may receive satisfactory adjustment in course of time.

#### THE OUTLOOK.

Has the Baptist work in Sweden an inherent capacity of self-perpetuation? Let it be remembered that this work is wholly indigenous. Valuable assistance has been received from America, but only for the purpose of furthering an activity begun and conducted by native agencies. This is evident from the fact that when Wiberg, the first who received pecuniary aid from abroad, returned from America in 1855, there were already several hundred Baptists here. From first to last the results are due, under God, to the labors of native preachers. The Baptist cause is not a tender exotic demanding, like the work among the Burmese or Telugus, the constant supervision of foreign missionaries, but a sturdy growth has struck deep roots into the underlying granite, and that, like the pines on the hill-side, will live and thrive despite northern cold and winter storms.

The membership has been steadily increasing notwithstanding the annual loss by emigration, which last year amounted to 600. The exclusions were 1275, but this is explained partly by strictness of discipline and partly by the fact that no members are dropped here as in America. Loss by purification is a sign of health.

Will the movement here become independent of American aid? Certainly. Whether it would be expedient to withdraw that aid at once must be determined by the situation. As a rule there is more poverty here than in the United States. Wages are low and the cost of living high. The accessions to the churches have almost wholly come from the laboring classes. Probably not more than five or six men in the denomination are worth over 200,000 kronor (\$54,000), and the number who can support their families in comfort

is comparatively small. A good domestic servant receives 100 kronor (\$27) a year, and a shoemaker from 2.50 to 3.00 kronor a day for twelve hours of work. In America the former obtains from \$125 to \$200 a year, and the latter from \$1.50 to \$3 a day for ten hours' work. On comparing the total membership with the contributions it will be seen that the average reaches nearly ten kronor each. I fear that in America, with a more general distribution of wealth, the average is not so high. But in addition to this we should remember that the Baptists here are taxed, at the lowest estimate, 60,000 kronor a year for the support of the State church—two or three times the amount of the aid received from America. Only eight churches raised over 5000 kronor, while 94 were able to raise only 100 kronor, or less. But the Baptists here are growing both in means and in popular consideration, and it may be added that the spirit of benevolence increases in proportion to the means. The Baptists in Stockholm support four or five churches, besides contributing liberally to the weaker country churches, whose pastors usually receive very meagre salaries. What if outside aid were withdrawn? Those who give little or nothing now could not be induced to give more, while those who conscientiously bear heavy burdens would be overburdened. In many directions the work would be seriously crippled, if not temporarily suspended, notably that of the seminary. Many pastors who now, with a trifling assistance from the Missionary Union, manage to live, could not live on the amount raised by their churches, and would be forced to emigrate to America. In other words, in the face of a pressing need of more preachers, the number on the field would be greatly diminished, and the source of supply cut off. The work would not cease, but it would be sadly crippled for a time at least, or until the churches could in some measure adjust themselves to the change. Moreover, the churches in Stockholm are still suffering from a mania in real estate speculation that seized the city a few years ago. Many, poor in the morning, were rich at night, but the collapse of the bubble left a still larger number financially ruined. At the same time an alarming spirit of worldliness crept into the churches; but reverses had a most salutary influence in restoring a higher spirituality. Unquestionably independence and self-support are much more desirable than dependence, however small, and such a desire is freely expressed here, with the hope that it may soon be attained.

Yet an entire withdrawal of aid would just now be likely to do more harm than good. Aside from the needs of the seminary, this aid is used with the greatest care, and only for the purpose of helping buckle and strap to meet in the domestic economy of poorly paid country pastors. A gradual diminution, to which the churches could adjust themselves as their means slowly increase, would be preferable. Furthermore, it should not be forgotten that American Baptists, to say nothing of the United States at large, receive far more in return from the Swedes who emigrate than we send back in assisting the Baptists here. It is rather the payment of a just debt than benevolence.

In conclusion, it may be fairly said that a careful survey of the situation compels the conviction that the Baptist movement in Sweden continues, in the face of many difficulties and hindrances, to expand along normal lines, and in the direction of solidity, strength, and perpetuity. Much patient, admirable, and heroic work has been done, many sufferings endured, and great sacrifices freely and joyfully made. That there are weak points open to criticism cannot be denied, but the same is true of the denomination in England or America. A long-continued dissension, fruitful of bitterness and strife in the Stockholm Association, and from which deplorable consequences have been feared, is not yet definitely settled. It is to be hoped that wise and kind counsels may prevail, and that the cause of Christ may suffer no permanent injury from a difficulty that appears largely personal. We are assured that the Divine Spirit, who apparently, without human agencies, began his gracious work in Sweden, will, despite human mistakes and frailties, carry it to a glorious consummation.

## PRESIDENT WOOLSEY AND PROBATION AFTER DEATH.

From *The Congregationalist*, Boston.

WE have read, with great interest, a very just characterization of the late Dr. Woolsey, in the August number of the *Andover Review*. It speaks with emphasis of his extraordinary energy of moral feeling, his love of justice, and his horror of insincerity, and intimates that his mind was very full of noble wisdom. The fact that he was chairman of the American company of New Testament revisers would seem to confirm what is surely a



very extended impression, that probably he was the highest authority in New Testament Greek whom this country has produced.

Under these circumstances we venture to think that his opinion, carefully written in the autumn of 1884, and communicated to an American clergyman, as to the just interpretation to be put upon 2 Cor. 5: 10, will be read with interest. The text, as given by the revisers, is:

"For we must all be made manifest before the judgment-seat of Christ; that each one may receive the things *done* in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it *be* good or bad."

Dr. Woolsey's comment follows:

"I would say, first, that, as far as I can see, '*we*,' if we go back quite a number of verses, refers especially to the apostle himself, while also including others engaged with him in the work of the ministry. But his thought does not exclude others; as when he says, 'We must all appear,' where I can hardly help thinking that he was including also others to whom the Gospel was preached by him, or others. Hence, he says, 'We must *all* appear'—*i. e.*, those who preach Christ, and those who had been taught Christ.

"This is to be observed in the New Testament, that the doctrine of the general judgment is sometimes applied to those who have had the Gospel preached to them, as well as to others who have not. Christ is the general judge; but those who have never heard of Christ are not judged according to the same standard of character as those who have had Christ preached to them. Compare Matt. 25: 37-44.

"But if Christ is judge of quick and dead, he judges according to exact justice. Thus to those in the passage referred to (Matt. 25: 37), 'When saw we thee an hungred, and fed thee?' who substantially pleaded that they had never seen Christ, he says, 'Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto me.' Those who are not condemned may, in part, consist of such.

"Paul evidently expects to be judged himself for what he has done; which, by the interpretation given by Christ (in Matthew) would subject him to condemnation, if he had known Christ, and had not loved, and faithfully served him.

"*May receive the things done in the body according to what he hath done.*' In New Testament and other Greek, the article with a clause often constitutes a sentence, even when an important word is to be supplied.

Thus here: *Tà διὰ τοῦ σώματος* would mean those things that are by means of the body, and *δύνα* the participle of the verb 'to be,' being often understood, may be so understood here. Thus we have 'things that come to be, or exist, by means of the body,' or, as we loosely say, are 'in the body.' I am inclined to think, however, that the apostle supplied in thought 'things that are done through the agency of the body.' This appears probable from his adding *πρὸς ἃ ἐπαξεν*, where the verb 'to do' immediately following allows an ellipsis of the participle of the same: 'that every one may receive'—*i. e.*, may be retributed, 'according to,' etc. Compare Rom. 8: 13.

"There is no evidence that I know of in the New Testament of a future probation. The only point bearing upon it at all is our Lord's rule of general justice, in Luke 12: 47, 48: 'Shall be beaten *with many stripes*—*with few stripes.*' But this reveals nothing but a principle.

"I am sorry to see the readiness to receive Universalist doctrines, which rest on no foundation whatever."

## THE TRUE STORY OF SERVETUS.

BY PROFESSOR J. W. RICHARD, D.D.

From *The Lutheran Observer*, Philadelphia.

ONE of the most industrious and scholarly pastors, on reading the following statement in Professor Fisher's "History of the Christian Church," p. 327, "Yet he (Calvin) believed that such an attack upon the fundamental truths of religion as Servetus had made should be punished with death—this opinion he shared with Bullinger. Zwingli's successor, and even with the gentlest of the reformers, Melancthon"—asks: "Is it true that *even* Melancthon is involved in that deed which has cast such a dark cloud over the character of Calvin?" and requests an answer in the *Observer*.

Michael Servetus was born in Aragon in the year 1509. He studied theology at Strasburg, where he attacked the doctrine of the Trinity. This caused him to be denounced as "a wicked and cursed Spaniard." He then wrote a book entitled "The Errors of the Trinity," 1531. About the year 1537 he had several private discussions with Calvin, whom he challenged to a public disputation, but which he himself avoided. For several years he kept up a correspondence with Calvin, and finally sent him an extract from a work which he was then preparing,

entitled "Christianity Restored," and expressed a desire of coming to Geneva. This so enraged Calvin, that on February 13th, 1546, he wrote to Farel: "Servetus lately wrote me, and coupled with his letter a long volume of his delirious fancies, with the Thrasonic boast, that I should see something astonishing and unheard of. He takes it upon him to come hither, if it be agreeable for me. But I am unwilling to pledge my word for his safety, for if he shall come, I shall never permit him to depart alive, provided my authority be of any avail" ("Letters," p. 33). This threat was made seven years before it was carried into execution. The passage shows that Calvin's hostility was based wholly upon considerations of religion, and not upon considerations of politics, as is often alleged; for up to this time Servetus had not been at Geneva, and consequently had taken no part in the political complications which gave Calvin so much trouble. *Calvin deliberately determined to have Servetus put to death because he denied the doctrine of the Trinity and held other "delirious fancies."*

The relations between Calvin and Servetus were then interrupted for several years, for September 1st, 1548, Calvin writes to Viret: "I think I once read to you my answer to Servetus. I was at length disinclined from striving longer with the incurable obstinacy of a heretic; and, indeed, I ought to have followed the advice of Paul. He now attacks you. You will see how long you ought to persist in rebutting his follies. He will twist nothing out of me henceforward" ("Letters," p. 33, note.)

At length, in 1553, Servetus appeared at Geneva, "where he went skulking about. He was forthwith recognized by a certain person and cast into prison. Calvin also, whom he treated very unhandsomely by name in thirty printed letters, held the cause of the Church against him in the Council, in the presence of a great assemblage of the pious. He continued in his impiety. What will come of it I know not. Let us pray the Lord to purge his Church of these ministers." So wrote Beza to Bullinger, August 27th, 1553 (Calvin's "Letters," II., p. 416, note).

On August 20th, 1553, Calvin wrote to Farel: "We have now new business in hand with Servetus. He intended, perhaps, passing through this city, for it is not yet known with what design he came. But after he had been recognized, I thought that he should be detained. My friend Nicolas summoned him on a capital charge, offering

himself as security, according to the *lex talionis*. On the following day he adduced against him forty written charges. He at first sought to evade them. Accordingly we were summoned. He impudently reviled me, just as if he regarded me as obnoxious to him. I answered him as he deserved. At length the Senate pronounced all the charges proven. . . . I hope the sentence of death will at least be passed upon him, but I desire that the severity of the punishment may be mitigated" ("Letters," II., p. 417). Thus, true to his threat made seven years before, Calvin caused the arrest of Servetus so soon as he was recognized, appeared as his prosecutor, "answered him as he deserved," and expressed the hope that the Senate would condemn him to death. It is doubtless true that at his trial Servetus did demean himself in a most insolent manner, and indeed sought to enlist Calvin's political enemies, the Libertines, in his favor and defence; yet neither of these things, but Calvin's now seven-years-old determination, caused his arrest and prosecution. Calvin had made up his mind already in 1546 that Servetus should never pass through Geneva alive, "if his authority availed anything." The opportune moment came, and Calvin did not let it pass unimproved. And that the sentence against Servetus gave Calvin great pleasure is shown by a letter which he wrote to Farel October 26th, 1553: "Behold what will give you some gratification. Instead of our epistle, here is a summary which will not occupy long time. The messenger has returned from the Swiss churches. They are unanimous in pronouncing that Servetus has now renewed those impious errors with which Satan formerly disturbed the Church, and that he is a monster not to be borne. . . . He was without doubt condemned. He will be led forth to punishment to-morrow. We endeavored to alter the mode of death, but in vain" ("Letters," II., p. 435). Accordingly, October 27th, 1553, Servetus was burned at the stake. Calvin had sought to have him put to death by the sword.

The "Swiss churches," to which Calvin refers in the above extract, were unanimous in their judgment that the Church ought to be rid of such a pest as Servetus, but *they gave no expression of the nature of the punishment which ought to be inflicted on the accused.*

Commenting on this sad affair, Dr. Jules Bonnet, the compiler of Calvin's letters, says: "The error of Calvin in the death of Servetus was, we may say, altogether that



of his age, inasmuch as men of the most conciliating and moderate dispositions—viz., Bucer, Eccolampadius, Melanchthon, and Bullinger, were at one in their approval of the condemnation of the unfortunate Spanish innovator" (Calvin's "Letters," II., p. 436, note).

I do not have in hand the means of verifying this statement in regard to Bucer, Eccolampadius, and Bullinger. But, October 14th, 1554, Melanchthon wrote Calvin as follows: "I have read the writing in which you have clearly refuted the horrid blasphemies of *Servetus*, and I give thanks to the Son of God, who was judge in this contest. Also to you the Church, both now and hereafter, owes and will owe gratitude. I indeed approve your judgment. I affirm also that your magistrates did right, after proper examination, in putting the blasphemer to death" ("Corpus Reformatorium," VIII., p. 362).

We close with the following observations:

1. The burning of *Servetus* was purely a case of religious persecution. Politics had nothing at all to do with it. This is shown (a) by Calvin's letter of February 13th, 1546; (b) by the judgments of the "Swiss churches;" (c) by the letter of Melanchthon.

2. It is a dark shadow on the fame of Calvin that he carried this purpose in his heart for seven years. But both in his conduct in the premises, and in the approbation of Melanchthon and others, religious persecution was the sad, terrible legacy of the Church in which all these men had been born and educated. They had not yet had time to rid themselves entirely from its baleful influence.

3. Luther was the great apostle of religious freedom. Already in 1525 and in 1529 he counselled forbearance with heretics and opposers of the Gospel, and subsequently declared that if violence was to prevail, then the hangman would be the most learned doctor (De Wette, II., p. 622; III., p. 498).

## CHRISTIAN LITERATURE IN CHINA.

BY B. C. HENRY.

From *The Evangelist*, New York.

THE fact that the Chinese are a literary people, numbering their scholars by millions, their Bachelors of Arts, or "Elegant Sprouts," as they express it, by hundreds of thousands, and their Masters of Arts, or "Elevated Men," by tens of thousands, has always, and very properly, been cited

as a point of special significance and encouragement to the missionary as he offers them the Bible and a Christian literature. Their respect for learning, which makes the literary class the true aristocracy of the land, and their reverence for the written or printed page, which will not permit even a scrap of paper inscribed with their sacred characters to be put to any base use, and leads them to employ thousands of men whose sole work is to go from house to house, from shop to shop, and from street to street, collecting old letters, the scribbled memoranda of clerks, and all the fragments of printed paper that may lie scattered about, and have them carefully burned in little hollow towers erected for the purpose, on which are inscribed the words "Respect the written paper"—show their high and almost superstitious regard for books and learning. This love of letters, this homage paid at the shrine of learning, have without doubt prepared the way and greatly facilitated the spread of Christian books; and in the same line, the production of a Christian literature has been carried forward with an energy and a fruitfulness worthy of the cause—the various publishing societies and printing presses, a thousand or more different publications. Many of the books produced are models of style and monuments of learning, and have received high and well-deserved praise from the best Chinese literary authorities.

With the splendid array of Christian books so prepared—the Bible in several forms of the literary or book style, and in a dozen of the principal vernaculars of the Empire, accompanied by a good supply of commentaries on nearly the whole New Testament and parts of the Old—with excellent works on Christian ethics and the practical phases of Christianity, together with some admirable treatises on science from a Christian standpoint, it would seem that the chief and comparatively easy task now is to supply the people with our books, so admirably suited to the purpose, and the conquest of China is sure to follow. But at this point a tremendous barrier is raised in the ultra-conservatism of the people and the hatred of all foreign innovations. This deep-rooted and most unreasonable prejudice against and contempt for the foreigner, and all that pertains to him, is more marked among the literary class than any other. So it happens, in spite of their great respect for learning, and in spite of an ample supply of books in every way suited to remove prejudice and awaken interest in Christian truth, we find it most difficult to secure an

impartial hearing for our books. The very men for whom many of them are specially prepared, and who can best understand and appreciate them, refuse to open or read them. If we could only get the scholars to read our books, the battle would be more than half won.

I do not overlook or disparage the fact that there is an increasing spirit of inquiry on the part of many of the most intelligent Chinese. It is, however, chiefly in the line of science and applied mechanics. I refer now to the mass of the literati in their attitude toward Christian books. I once invited a literary graduate, the father of one of our Chinese Christians, to share my boat from a distant city to Canton, hoping that during the week's journey I could lead him to take some interest in the study of our books, especially as I was told he was an indefatigable reader and a diligent student. At favorable times, when our conversation had led up to the subject, I presented him with a book on natural theology, especially adapted to Chinese modes of thought, another upon the evidence of Christianity, and another upon the errors of geomancy, in which he was a devout believer. Each book, in style and subject-matter, was admirably fitted to attract a Chinese scholar. He received them with apparent appreciation, but never read beyond the title-page; and at the journey's end, with a profusion of thanks, returned them to me unopened! His is a typical case. They refuse to be enlightened. With their intense prejudice against foreign things, is often mingled a superstitious fear of some occult influences emanating from the books themselves, which helps to deter them from opening and reading them.

The great problem, then, is how to get the intelligent people to read our books and know what they teach, instead of accepting the gross misrepresentations of their contents put forth and widely disseminated by designing people. Missionaries have racked their brains from year to year over this question, and hail with delight any fresh scheme that promises a fuller hearing for our cause. The interest of the native Church has been aroused, and in the multitude of counsels evoked are some specimens of native wisdom on the subject, which are not merely interesting, but very significant and instructive. They meet the question full in the face, and challenge the fullest investigation of the truth or error of our teaching in a most straightforward and practical manner.

One scheme proposed by a promising young preacher of the London Mission

contemplates the establishment of depositories in all the leading literary centres of the Empire, where suitable rooms on the most frequented streets shall be opened, and on the shelves, in attractive form, shall be placed all the leading Christian publications—Bibles, periodicals, works on religion, apologetics, history, science, etc. At each centre a staff agent (all of them earnest, reliable, exemplary Christian men) shall be employed, whose work it shall be to canvass the whole country once in three months. There shall be no preaching in the ordinary sense; nor shall the books be sold. The pith and virtue of the whole scheme is that the books shall simply be loaned without the payment of any fee. As the agent passes through his district, he is to supply all who wish them with books, entering their names and residences in his note-book, and announcing that in three months' time he will appear again with a fresh supply, when the people can return the books already received and obtain another set. There shall be no pecuniary transaction and no formal preaching. The printed messengers shall be quietly sent on their way and allowed to exert their silent influence. The scheme shall be undenominational, and no one shall be permitted to manipulate it for sectarian purposes. The plan has many good points, and the widespread diffusion of Christian truth it contemplates is inspiring; but the question of its practical operation remains unsettled.

Another plan, originating in the same Mission, is now in operation, and promises well as to results. The plan is this: Prizes of considerable value are offered for the best essays on the New Testament and its teachings. The contest is open to all except members of Christian churches. Each contestant as he enters his name is supplied with a New Testament, a Bible Dictionary, and other helps; and, as the result of his own personal study of the Gospel, is required to prepare an essay in the form prescribed, which with the others, at a certain date, will be examined by a competent committee, and the prizes awarded accordingly. A large number have already entered the contest, and the close and systematic study of the Scriptures which it involves cannot fail to awaken a deeper interest in some minds than the mere hope of a pecuniary reward. We are looking with great interest for the results of this attempt to enlist Chinese scholars in the study of Christian truth. In no country is it more true than in China, that we must "become all things to all men, that we may by all means win some."



## THE REVISION OF THE WESTMINSTER CONFSSION.

BY PROF. W. G. T. SHEDD, D.D., LL.D.

From *The Evangelist*, New York.

THE question whether the Westminster Confession shall be revised, has been properly referred to the whole Church represented by the Presbyteries. The common sentiment of the denomination must determine the matter. The expression of opinion during the few months prior to the Presbyterian action is, therefore, of consequence. It is desirable that it should be a full expression of all varieties of views, and as a contribution toward it, we purpose to assign some reasons why the revision of the Confession is not expedient.

1. In the first place, it is inexpedient, because in its existing form as drawn up by the Westminster Assembly it has met, and well met, all the needs of the Church for the past two centuries. The Presbyterian Church in the United States since 1700 has passed through a varied and sometimes difficult experience. The controversies in the beginning between the Old and New Lights, and still more the vehement disputes that resulted in the division of the Church in 1837, have tried the common symbol as severely as it is ever likely to be. But through them all both theological divisions were content with the Confession and Catechisms as they stood, and both alike claimed to be true to them. Neither party demanded a revision on any doctrinal points; and both alike found in them a satisfactory expression of their faith. What is there in the Presbyterian Church of to-day that necessitates any different statement of the doctrine of decrees, of atonement, of regeneration, or of punishment, from that accepted by the Presbyterian Church of 1837 or 1789? Are the statements upon these points any more liable to misconception or misrepresentation by non-Calvinists now than they were fifty or a hundred years ago? Are there any more "weak consciences" requiring softening explanations and relaxing clauses in the Church of to-day than in former periods? And with reference to the allowable differences of theological opinion within the Presbyterian Church, is not a creed that was adopted and defended by Charles Hodge and Albert Barnes sufficiently broad to include all who are really Calvinistic and Presbyterian in belief? What is there, we repeat, in the condition of the Presbyterian Church of to-day that makes the old Confession of the past two

hundred years inadequate as a doctrinal Standard? All the past successes and victories of Presbyterianism have been accomplished under it. Success in the past is guarantee for success in the future. Is it not better for the Church to work on the very same old bases, in the very same straight line?

2. Revision is inexpedient, because the reunion of the two divisions of the Church was founded upon the Confession as it now stands. A proposition to unite the two branches of Presbyterianism by first revising the Westminster documents would have failed, because in the revision individual and party preferences would have shown themselves. But when the Standards pure and simple were laid down as the only terms of union, the whole mass of Presbyterians flowed together. It is to be feared that if a revision of the Confession should take place, there will be a dissatisfied portion of the Church who will prefer to remain upon the historic foundation; that the existing harmony will be disturbed; and that the proposed measures for union with other Presbyterian bodies will fall through.

3. Revision is inexpedient, because it will introduce new difficulties. The explanations will need to be explained. The revision that is called for is said by its more conservative advocates not to be an alteration of the doctrine of the Confession, but an explanation only. Now, *good and sufficient* explanations of a creed require more space than can be afforded in a concise symbol intended for use in inducting officers and members. Such full and careful explanations have been made all along from the beginning, and the Presbyterian Board of Publication has issued a large and valuable library of them. No one need be in any doubt respecting the meaning of the Confession who will carefully peruse one or more of them. He who is not satisfied with the Westminster doctrine as so explained will not be satisfied with it at all. But if brief explanations are inserted into the Confession itself, their brevity will inevitably expose them to misunderstanding and misconception. Take an illustration: An able minister and divine, whose Calvinism is unimpeachable, suggests that Confession III. 3 shall read, "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained [for their sins] to everlasting death." If the clause in brackets is inserted without further explanation, the article might fairly and naturally be understood to teach that the reason why

God passes by a sinner in the bestowment of regenerating grace is the sinner's sin. But St. Paul expressly says that the sinner's sin is not the cause of his non-election to regeneration. "The children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, it was said, the elder shall serve the younger. Esau have I hated" (Rom. 10 : 11-13). The reason for the difference between the elect and non-elect is not the holiness or the sin of either of them, but God's sovereign good pleasure. "He hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth" (Rom. 9 : 18). An explanation like this, without further explanation such as the proposer would undoubtedly make, would not only contradict Scripture, but change the Calvinistic doctrine into the Arminian. The reason for non-election would no longer be secret and sovereign, but known and conditional. All this liability to misconstruction is avoided by the Confession itself as it now stands. For in Confession III. 7, after saying that the "passing by" in the bestowment of regenerating grace is an act of God's sovereign pleasure, "whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth," it then adds that "the ordaining to dishonor and wrath" is "for sin." Sin is here represented as the reason for the judicial act of punishing, but not for the sovereign act of not regenerating. The only reason for the latter, our Lord gives in His "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight."

Other illustrations might be given of the difficulty of avoiding misconception when a systematic creed is sought to be explained, particularly in its difficult points, by the brief interpolation of words and clauses. The method is too short. More space is required than can be spared. It is better, therefore, to let a carefully constructed and concisely phrased creed like the Westminster stand exactly as it was drawn up by the sixty-nine commissioners, in the five weekly sessions for nearly nine years, and have it explained, qualified, and defended in published treatises, in sermons, and especially in catechetical lectures. Had the ministry been as faithful as it should in years past in catechetical instruction, there would be little difficulty in understanding the Westminster creed. The remedy needed is in this direction, not in that of a revision.

4. Revision is inexpedient, because there is no end to the process. It is like the letting out of water. The doctrine of the divine decrees is the particular one selected by the Presbytery whose request has brought the subject of revision before the General

Assembly. But this doctrine runs entirely through the Westminster documents, so that if changes were made merely in Chapter III. of the Confession, this chapter would be wholly out of harmony with the remainder. Effectual calling, regeneration, perseverance of the saints, are all linked in with the divine decree. The most cursory perusal will show that a revision of the Confession on this one subject would amount to an entire recasting of the creed.

5. Revision is inexpedient, because it may abridge the liberty of interpretation now afforded by the Confession. As an example of the variety in explanation admitted by the creed as it now stands, take the statement that "God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in the beginning, created or made from nothing the world, and all things therein, in the space of six days." He who holds the patristic view that the days of Genesis were periods, and he who holds the modern opinion that the days were solar, can subscribe to the Westminster statement. But if revised in the interest of either view, the subscriber is shut up to it alone. Another example is found in the statement respecting the guilt of Adam's sin. The advocate of natural union, or of representative union, or of both in combination, can find a foothold, provided only that he holds to the penal nature of the first sin. Another instance is the article concerning "elect infants." As the tenet was formulated by the Assembly, it may mean (a) that all infants dying in infancy are elected as a class, some being saved by covenanted mercy, and some by uncovenanted mercy; (b) that all infants dying in infancy are elected as a class—all alike, those within the Church and those outside of it, being saved by divine mercy, nothing being said of the covenant; (c) that some dying infants are elect, and some non-elect. Probably each of these opinions had its representatives in the Assembly, and hence the indefinite form of the statement. The writer regards the first-mentioned view as best supported by Scripture and the analogy of faith; but there are many who advocate the second view, and perhaps there may be some who hold the third. The liberty of opinion now conceded by the Confession on a subject respecting which the Scripture data are few, would be ill-exchanged for a stricter statement that would admit of but one meaning.

6. Revision is inexpedient, because the Westminster Confession, as it now reads, is a sufficiently broad and liberal creed. We do not say that it is sufficiently broad and liberal for every man and every denomina-



tion; but it is as broad and liberal for a Calvinist as any Calvinist should desire. For whoever professes Calvinism, professes a precise form of doctrine. He expects to keep within definite metes and bounds; he is not one of those religionists who start from no premises, and come to no conclusions, and hold no tenets. The Presbyterian Church is a Calvinistic Church. It will be the beginning of its decline, as it already has been of some Calvinistic denominations, when it begins to swerve from this dogmatic position. It must therefore be distinguished among the Churches for doctrinal consistency, comprehensiveness, and firmness. But inside of the metes and bounds established by divine revelation, and to which it has voluntarily confined itself, it has a liberty that is as large as the kingdom of God. It cannot get outside of that kingdom, and should not desire to. But within it, it is as free to career as a ship in the ocean, as an eagle in the air. Yet the ship cannot sail beyond the ocean, nor the eagle fly beyond the sky. Liberty within the immeasurable bounds and limits of God's truth is the only true liberty. All else is license. The Westminster Confession, exactly as it now reads, has been the creed of as free and enlarged intellects as ever lived on earth. The substance of it was the strong and fertile root of the two freest movements in modern history—that of the Protestant Reformation and that of Republican Government. No Presbyterian should complain that the creed of his Church is narrow and stifling.

And here we notice an objection urged against the Confession relative to the tenet of limited redemption. It is said that it is not sufficiently broad and liberal in announcing the boundless compassion of God toward all men indiscriminately, and in inviting all men without exception to cast themselves upon it. But read and ponder the following statements:

“Repentance unto life is an evangelical grace, the doctrine whereof is to be preached in season and out of season by every minister of the Gospel, as well as that of faith in Christ. It is every man's duty to endeavor to repent of his particular sins, particularly. Every man is bound to make private confession of his sins to God, praying for the pardon thereof, upon which, and the forsaking of them, he shall find mercy. Prayer, with thanksgiving, being one special part of religious worship, is by God required of all men. Prayer is to be made for all sorts of men living, or that shall live hereafter, but not

for the dead. God is to be worshipped everywhere in spirit and in truth, and in secret each one by himself. God in his Word, by a positive moral Commandment, binds all men in all ages. The grace of God is manifested in the second covenant, in that he freely provideth and offereth to sinners a Mediator, and life and salvation in him. The ministry of the Gospel testifies that whosoever believes in Christ shall be saved, and excludes none that will come unto him. God is able to search the heart, hear the requests, pardon the sins, and fulfil the desires of all.”

These declarations, scattered broadcast through the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, teach the universality of the Gospel, except no human creature from the offer of it, and exclude no human creature from its benefits. Their consistency with the doctrine of election is assumed, but not explained in the Confession of Faith. And no revision of this by the mere interpolation of a few words or clauses will make the subject any clearer or stop all objections.

7. Revision is inexpedient, because the Westminster Standards already make full provision for those exceptional cases, on account of which revision is claimed by its advocates to be needed. It is said that there are some true believers in the Lord Jesus Christ who cannot adopt all the Westminster statements, who yet should not be, and actually are not excluded from the Presbyterian Church; that there are tender consciences of good men whose scruples are to be respected. But these cases are referred by the Form of Government to the church Session, and power is given to it to receive into membership any person who trusts in the blood of Christ for the remission of sin, although his doctrinal knowledge and belief may be unsatisfactory on some points. He may stumble at predestination, but if with the publican he cries, “God be merciful to me a sinner,” he has the root of the matter in him, and is a regenerate child of God. But why should the whole Presbyterian Church revise its entire creed, so as to make it fit these exceptional cases? Why should the mountain go to Mohammed? Why should a genuine but deficient evangelical knowledge and experience be set up as the type of doctrine for the whole denomination? These “babes in Christ” need the education of the full and complete system of truth, and should gradually be led up to it, instead of bringing the system down to their level. There is sometimes a misconception at this point. We have seen it stated that the membership

of the Presbyterian Church is not required or expected to hold the same doctrine with the officers; that the pastor, elders, and deacons must accept the Confession of Faith "as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures," but that the congregation need not. But this error arises from confounding the toleration of a deficiency with the endorsement of it. Because a church Session tolerates in a particular person who gives evidence of faith in Christ an error respecting foreordination, or even some abstruse point in the Trinity or the incarnation, it does not thereby endorse the error. It does not sanction his opinion on these subjects, but only endures it, in view of his religious experience on the vital points of faith and repentance, and with the hope that his subsequent growth in knowledge will bring him to the final rejection of it. The Presbyterian Church tolerates theatre-going in some of its members—that is to say, it does not discipline them for it. But it does not formally approve of and sanction theatre-going. A proposition to revise the Confession by inserting a clause to this effect, in order to meet the wishes and practice of theatre-going church-members, would be voted down by the Presbyteries.

The position that the officers of a church may have one creed, and the membership another, is untenable. No church could live and thrive upon it. A Trinitarian clergy preaching to an Arian or Socinian membership would preach to unwilling hearers. And although the difference is not so great and so vital, yet a Calvinistic clergy preaching to an Arminian membership, or an Arminian clergy to a Calvinistic membership, would on some points find unsympathetic auditors. Pastor and people, officers and members, must be homogeneous in doctrine, in order to a vigorous church-life. If, therefore, a certain class of members is received into a church, who do not on all points agree with the Church creed, this is not to be understood as giving the members generally a liberty to depart from the Church creed, or to be a reason for revising it.

The case is different with the officers of the church. There is *no exceptional class* in this instance. Neither the Session nor the Presbytery have any authority to dispense with the acceptance of any part of the Confession of Faith, when a pastor, elder, or deacon is inducted into office. There is no toleration of defective views provided for when those who are to teach and rule the Church are put into the ministry. And

this for the good reason that ministers and elders are expected to be so well indoctrinated, that they are "apt to teach" and competent to "rule well." Some propose "loose subscription" as a remedy, when candidates of lax or unsettled views present themselves for licensure and ordination. This is demoralizing, and kills all simplicity and godly sincerity. Better a thousand times for a denomination to alter its creed, than to allow its ministry to "palter with words in a double meaning;" than to permit an Arian subscription to the Nicene Symbol, an Arminian subscription to the Westminster Confession, a Calvinistic subscription to the Articles of Wesley, a Restorationist subscription to the doctrine of endless punishment.

For these reasons, it seems to us that the proposed revision of the Westminster Confession is not wise or expedient. The revision of a denominational creed is a rare occurrence in ecclesiastical history. Commonly a denomination remains from first to last upon the base that was laid for it in the beginning by its fathers and founders. And when revision does occur, it is seldom in the direction of fullness and precision. Usually the alteration is in favor of vague and looser statements. Even slight changes are apt to be followed by greater ones. The disposition to revise and alter needs watching. In an age when the general drift of the unregenerate world is away from the strong statements of the Hebrew prophets, of Christ and his inspired Apostles, it is of the utmost importance that the regenerate Church, in all its denominations, should stand firm in the old paths, and hold fast to that "Word of God which is sharper than a two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit."

## HOW TO REACH THE MASSES.

From *Christian Register*, Boston.

MR. MOODY has established a school in Chicago for the training of students for Christian work in the great cities. He has buildings already which cost \$100,000, and an endowment of \$125,000 in addition. He outlined to a Boston *Herald* reporter his general plan.

"We want," he says, "to reach the men and women in our cities. Three fourths of the people in these large places do not go to church. We must have a different class of

men and women from what we have now if we are going to reach these people. Our theological seminaries are training preachers for the intellectual classes of the community, but that training disqualifies them for reaching the mechanics and the other classes who make up most of the population of our large cities. We must have a different class of workers to reach the people from the graduates of our theological seminaries. I do not propose to teach Latin and Greek and Hebrew in this new institution in Chicago, but to give the students a thorough knowledge of the Bible. We want men of business training, men who understand the book of human nature, men who know what the people need and how to reach them. You take a man who has gone to a fitting school for several years, then four years to college, and then three years to a theological seminary, and he comes out with as little knowledge of human nature as if he had dropped out of the moon. Such men, as a class, are not qualified to reach the masses. I am not saying a word against the theological seminaries: they have their place. But the Rebellion would never have been put down by West Point graduates alone. We had to have volunteers. Just so it is here. We cannot do our work with nobody but the graduates of the seminaries. We must have volunteers. I must have the very best teachers that can possibly be found in the whole country. Then, too, such men as I want for students are rare. Now many men are scared from going into the Christian work because they see that it takes them a long time to be ready to begin. A young man doesn't know till he is twenty or twenty-three years old what he wants to do for a profession. But if he waits till then to decide to be a minister, and then goes to college and the seminary, he will be thirty years old by the time he is ready to begin work; and his life is half taken out of him by that time. We want to get at the matter practically, so that working Christians may know what they can do. My idea is to find a short cut to Christian work. Now, a young man, with a good English education, ought to be ready for his work in one or two years. There are two buildings in our institution in Chicago, one for women and one for men; and, with 200 students, it will cost \$30,000 a year to keep it up. But we are going to be very cautious about those we take. We do not want students without qualifications for our work. There would be no difficulty in fill-

ing up with those who want to come. Plenty of men and women live in the world who have natural gifts for our sort of work, but the trouble is in finding them. They have had training schools for foreign missionaries, and now we propose to train these young men and women for the work they are best fitted for. If they are best fitted for work in the musical service, we shall give them a training in music. If their power lies in visiting the sick, we shall train them for that. If it is in public speaking, then we shall train the student for that. If it is in visitation from house to house, we shall train them for that. Women are better qualified than men for this work. A woman can go to a woman right into her kitchen, and sit down by her wash-tub and give her help. If her children are sick, she can give them medicine or get a doctor for them; and so she can do a great deal of good in time of need. This is a practical work which we want to do, and it will speak louder than volumes of sermons.

"This work must be done, or there will be a revolution. It is reformation or revolution for our country. Things cannot go on as they are. Our republic cannot exist without righteousness. The wave of infidelity which swept over the country five years ago is receding. I do not find as much infidelity now in a month in the questions which are asked by the young men, after a meeting, as I used to find five years ago in one day. Then the young men were full of Ingersollism, and thought Christianity was worn out. But they have found that there is nothing to infidelity. It tears down, but does not build up. It does not give them anything. This is part of the same movement which we see in France. The men there are going back to the churches. Gambetta and those about him had such influence that they swept the men away from the churches. You might have gone there, and seen the churches attended by women and children, but no men. Now, however, the men are coming back. It is a part of the reaction against atheism. Now our cities are filling up with people who are thinking over new ideas, and they must be met. Just now there is a great movement toward Socialism, especially in such places as Chicago. When I was there, the people brought me their Socialist books to read; and I told them that, if I was half as earnest to have them Christians as they were to have me a Socialist, they would soon be converted."



## DEACONESSSES IN AMERICA.

BY ELIZABETH E. HOLDING.

From *The Christian at Work*, New York.

CENTENARY Methodist Episcopal Church in the city of Chicago witnessed an event recently of considerable significance to that denomination, for on that occasion were consecrated three Deaconesses. The European Deaconess, with her old-fashioned dress and white cap, is a not unfamiliar sight to travellers, but until recently the Order has been an exotic in this country. In 1849 Pastor Fliedner, the renowned founder of the Kaiserwerth community of Deaconesses in the Evangelical Lutheran Church, located two German Deaconesses at Pittsburg, Pa.; and it was confidently hoped that the Order would take root and flourish in this country as it has done in Europe. Unfortunately, such did not prove to be the case. The sisters were joined by three or four more, but probationers volunteered very slowly or not at all, some left the work, and besides caring for the sick in a small hospital in that city, not much has been done.

A more promising effort has been made, however, during this decade in Philadelphia, where a magnificent property has been donated for a "Mother-House of Deaconesses"—that is, a training home for Deaconess-probationers, a home for the active workers and a refuge in sickness and old age. In June, 1884, a little independent colony of Deaconesses was brought over from Prussia to assist in nursing in the German Hospital in that city. Several more have joined them from the "Fatherland," and at present they number eleven full Deaconesses and seventeen probationers, of whom, however, only two are of American birth. Mr. John D. Lankenau, a benevolent and devoted German gentleman, is the patron of this institution, as well as that of the German Hospital and the "Mary J. Drexel Home for the Aged" in Philadelphia. He built and furnished the magnificent building, one spacious wing of which is the "Mother House." He has also most generously endowed the home. Far more interest has attended this movement than followed the almost abortive attempt in Pittsburg; probationers are volunteering, and success seems assured to the work so auspiciously begun. A movement is also on foot among the Swedish Lutherans, several women being in training, and a fine home being in process of construction in Omaha, Neb. The work undertaken by these Dea-

conesses is at present confined to nursing the sick, but further work in more direct, or at least more common, mission lines is contemplated by the management of the Homes. It is to be regretted that the semi-foreign character of these Homes has prevented their attracting deserved attention from the philanthropic public.

The Episcopal Church has for many years encouraged women to live in communities, under the name of "Sisters" and Deaconesses. At present there are sixteen communities of Sisters in the United States, numbering about 250 Sisters and novitiates. Perhaps the most important of these Sisterhoods is the Community of St. Mary, in New York City, which was founded in 1865, and has at present ninety members, with novitiates. Sisters usually take the "threefold vow of chastity, poverty, and obedience" for life, but only after a period of probation extending from eighteen months to three or even five years. The practical work of the Sisters includes the care of the sick in the hospitals, the management of young ladies' schools, orphanages, refuges, reformatories, etc., a labor of love which commends them to our confidence and admiration. There is, however, an element of monasticism and an almost Romish ritualism in connection with Sisterhoods in general, which has incurred the suspicion of the so-called "broader" element, even in their own denomination. As for Deaconesses, there are but two communities of Deaconesses in the Episcopal Church, according to Canon Street in "The Living Church"—one in Alabama and one in Louisville, Ky.; and the members of these communities at the present time number only twelve—a melancholy contrast to the 250 Sisters—a contrast not explained by the distinction made by Episcopal authorities between a Deaconess and a Sister. Sisters must live in communities, while a Deaconess may or may not. The Sister is under rule "for the express purpose of discipline and formation of character." The Deaconess, though theoretically ranking as a church officer, is really only a parochial assistant. The vow of the Sister is usually for life, that of a Deaconess for a term of years only. In the one case, as in the other, a "vocation," a definite call is considered necessary. But—and here may be a hint as to the reason why Sisterhoods flourish and the Deaconess Communities languish—the Sister says her prayers, with or without beads, ten times a day, more or less. She sometimes goes to confession and does penance. She teaches French and music,

painting and needle-work in young ladies' schools, as well as attending to the more serious business of the hospital and reformatory; while the Deaconess is usually only a simple pastor's assistant, too busy to be much of a mystic or monastic.

The evident need of some new agency in dealing with the problems of modern civilization, and the manifest existence of this agency in the number of unemployed or frivolously employed women at the present time, attracts widespread attention and interest to the movement which is being inaugurated under the management of a more evangelistic branch of the Church in America. The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, its ultimate legislative body, meeting once in four years, authorized the creation of an Order of Deaconesses in May, 1888, whose duties should be "To minister to the poor, visit the sick, pray with the dying, care for the orphan, seek the wandering, comfort the sorrowing, save the sinning, and relinquishing all other pursuits, to devote themselves in a general way to such forms of Christian labor as may be suited to their abilities." The action of the conference being very indefinite, details have been taken up energetically by interested ministers and laymen in the denomination. The prescribed "two years of continuous service," prescribed by the Church as preliminary to licensing, has been translated to mean two years' careful preparation and training. A course of study has been adopted which covers most of the time of the first year, and the second year is spent in practical work, with a prescribed but rather light course of reading. There are required, examinations, a medical certificate, and a recommendation for the office from a "Quarterly Conference," a subordinate body of officers connected with some local church. The three Deaconesses consecrated in Chicago the other day are the only three in the United States who have passed the required conditions, and these were all graduates of the Chicago Training School for City, Home, and Foreign Missions. The vow of these Deaconesses is not for life, nor indeed for a term of years. The very use of the word "vow" is forbidden in express terms by the General Conference, which by the simplicity of its directions evidently intended to avoid anything like possible Romish abuse of the Order. There was a form of service used at the Consecration, however, in which a Bishop, the candidates, and the audience present had a part—all being supplied with printed copies. In the course of this ser-

vice, after the preliminaries, which consisted of a historical *resume* of the Order in the early Church and responsive readings between the Bishop and the people, Bishop Thomas Bowman, senior Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, addressed himself to the three candidates before him, reminding them that the duties to which they were being set apart were the same as those of early Deaconesses in the Church of God. He then asked them the following question: "Are you convinced that God has called you to this ministration in the Church?" to which they all responded: "I am." He then asked them a second and last question: "Do you, in the presence of God and this congregation, determine faithfully to perform the duties pertaining to the office of Deaconess in the Church of God?" They answered: "I do."

The connection of the Chicago Training School with the Deaconess movement is of interest. A year before the meeting of the General Conference in 1888 there was an unauthorized beginning of Deaconess work in connection with it in the city of Chicago.

In June, 1887, among the graduates of the Training School, which, by the way, is not literary but altogether technical in its training, were found eight or ten ladies willing to remain in the city during the summer, and continue the practical missionary work which had formed a part of their training in the school, provided they could be furnished with a home and board only—a basis of work. Partly on the faith plan and partly on the "desperation plan," as one of those taking the responsibility says, the managers of the Training School, Rev. J. S. Meyer and his wife, Lucy Ryder Meyer, determined to become responsible for the board and car-fare of these women; desperation because of the tremendous urgency of the city field during the hot summer months, when the pastors and Sunday-school teachers leave it and flee to the country for a much-needed rest and change. As fall approached it was found that the experiment had been wonderfully successful. Accounts were balanced with a trifle in the treasury. The demand for city mission work was increasing, and not only graduates from the Training School, but others were volunteering for the work, and again on a plan, which was a "mixture of faith and desperation," a house was rented—the Training School building being no longer available, on account of the return of the students—and the first Deaconess Home in the Methodist Episcopal Church in the

United States began its independent existence. It was called a Deaconess Home from the first, and how much this Home had to do with influencing the General Conference action remains a problem—certainly not a little. But for the establishment of this home, and the fact that its members passed the first of the two years of probation ordered by the General Conference, prior to that ordering, the interesting event at Centenary Church must have been delayed a whole year.

There are at present about thirty Deaconess probationers in the four Homes which have been established in Chicago, Cincinnati, New York, and Minneapolis. One of the difficulties attending this movement, as is the case in the German and Swedish work, has been the slowness of women to volunteer for this work, which is not to be wondered at, considering that there is no pecuniary inducement held out to them, as they receive nothing but a plain support, and that the movement as yet lacks the prestige and momentum of a large company and a long history. This, however, is gradually being removed, the number of applicants being larger and better than ever before.

The Presbyterians have taken decided commendatory action concerning the introduction of Deaconesses into their communion, both in the General Council last year and in their recent General Assembly in New York. It can hardly fail that practical steps will soon follow, and that other denominations will not be slow to adopt plans which are proving so successful.

As the knowledge of this work spreads, it will doubtless touch the hearts of many women with empty hands and unsatisfied hearts, as well as the hearts of many whose hands are not empty, and yet whose hearts are not satisfied. And may it not be that by this work of Christian women among the poor, the question of "reaching the masses" will, to a great extent, be solved?

## AN HOUR WITH HORATIUS BONAR.

BY H. PORTER SMITH, CAMBRIDGE.

From *The Congregationalist*, Boston.

DR. BONAR tenderly loved children, and wrote sweet hymns for them. How keenly those in Edinburgh will feel his loss! Being in that city a few years ago, it was my good fortune to hear him address an assembly of Sunday-school children, and before

he entered the pulpit sing with them some of his children songs. When he went up the long pulpit stairs, the children caught the inspiration of his presence, and sang with new strength and impressiveness. As has been said, his personal appearance and bearing reminded one of his hymns—"tender, sweet, and tranquil."

His long white hair made him look venerable, but he had no other mark of old age. His prayer was simple as a child. His voice was low, quiet, and persuasive. It had a decided Scotch accent, but was clear and pleasing. His whole manner was suggestive of his lines:

"Calm me, my God, and keep me calm;  
Let thine outstretched wing  
Be like the shade of Elim's palm  
Beside her desert spring."

He leaned over the high pulpit and spoke for nearly an hour, in a quiet manner, yet with a magnetic power that riveted every eye. The children looked steadily in his face. The address fastened itself upon my mind. He read with the children the first part of the third chapter of John. His manner of reading the Scriptures with them was to me novel as well as interesting, though I judge it to be a Scottish custom. He read: "There was a man of the Pharisees named"—here he paused, and the children responded, "Nicodemus." "The same came to Jesus by"—"night," responded the children. So, through the reading, the children read the word at which he paused. The harmony and promptness required, and the fact that they did not know the word at which he would stop, made the strictest attention necessary on their part. Occasionally he would say, very kindly, "Be careful, children."

The reading over, he spoke of the two questions which Nicodemus asked Jesus. The first was one of curiosity: "How can a man be born when he is old?" The second, one of intense personal interest: "How can these things be?" As if he had asked, "How can I be born again?" He then, in a most interesting manner, told the story of the lifting up of the brazen serpent, and portrayed vividly the scene of the suffering Israelites. He described a painting illustrating that scene; where some were turning their backs to the brazen serpent, though sorely bitten, others were employing physicians to heal them, while others were binding up their own wounds, and a few were obeying the command of Moses to look to the only source of help. Then he went on: "Must that old man look? Yes. Must that young man look? Yes. And that



young woman? Yes. Must that boy look, and that girl? Yes. Must that mother carrying her poor little smitten boy in her arms, turn his face so that he can look? Yes. How long must they look—a year? No. A month? No. A day? No, not a day. An hour? Not an hour. A minute? I hardly think it. Only just a look, and in a moment they will be healed."

I shall not attempt to tell how he showed to the children that

"There's life for a look at the crucified One."

It needs the tender persuasive tones of that voice now hushed, the large, soft, dark eyes now closed, to give the emphasis. This was a memorable Sabbath evening hour to the three Americans who were present.

This sweet and impressive hymn-writer has joined the heavenly choir. What a welcome he must have! How easy for him to take up the new song; and even his earthly face would not seem out of place in that choir.

"Praise Him above, ye heavenly host,"

we are singing here; and now he is responding there. Where is the Christian heart he has not helped, and to whom has he not endeared himself?

### THE CONTEST IN ITALY.

From *The Churchman*, New York.

THE troubles of the two rival powers in Italy, the King and the Pope, are increasing. Each has the faculty of wounding the other, but, like the gods in the Homeric contests—neither can kill nor extinguish. The Pope has formally excommunicated the King and Queen, which they, being devout children of the Church, feel deeply. The landlord of M. Crispi, the Prime Minister, being ecclesiastical—in fact, if we remember rightly, the College of the Propaganda—has turned him out of his pleasant domicile in the palazzo of a cardinal.

On the other hand, the anti-Papal powers have got hold of and published the documents relative to the trial (by torture) of Bruno, and also a concession by Pius IX. of relinquishment of the temporal power made to Austria when there seemed a chance that on no other terms could he get back to Rome. Also the Pope has been notified that he can leave Rome if he likes, but must leave also the treasures of the Vatican. The effect of all these things is to deepen the gulf between the two.

We are sorry to note this, because whatever the errors of Papalism, it is a better religion for Italy than none at all, and because the driving of the nation into infidelity can hardly accomplish that great work of national regeneration which has been so auspiciously begun. But most of all, the hope of a restored Christian unity lies in the reformation of the Roman Church. And this must be, to all human likelihood, accomplished from within; no external forces can reform Latin Christianity, because in its very essence it is impervious to external influence. It recognizes no other voice than one issuing from within its own borders.

All outside it lies a world either heathen or heretic and from that world it will take no suggestions. But a civil power acting in accord with it and professing to be guided by it in matters of faith might do much. We should look only for indirect changes, but these, if accepted by the Papacy, might be harmoniously brought about. What is needed is reconstruction, repair, cleansing and re-edifying, not the wholesale pulling down and casting out which would be the result of a successful battle won by the civil power of Italy.

### THE CONGREGATIONALIST MOVEMENT FOR LITURGIC SERVICE.

[From *The Churchman*, New York.

THE *Chicago Advance* has a very well written leader on the subject of the enrichment of public worship in the Congregational body. It says: "The Congregational churches are groping in the dark for a better service. They hardly know what they want; they still less know how to get whatever they may want; but they do know they want something to render the service of worship more vigorous and impressive."

In the further discussion of the subject, the *Advance* says, "the enrichment will be characterized as being biblical." Again, it says, "we have indeed well-nigh worshipped the Bible, putting it on the pulpit and letting it there stay, but we have not adequately used the Bible as a means of worship in the pews."

Of course we do not contradict this confession of the *Advance* in behalf of the denomination it represents. But we should hardly like to have said so harsh a thing ourselves, of so respectable a body of our fellow Christians. It is doubtless true in certain instances, because the very nature

of extemporized worship will allow the neglect of the Bible if the minister so chooses. There is no power to compel him to do even so much as to take a text for his sermon from its pages, and it is possible for him to restrict his Scripture readings to a very narrow range. The Church Lectionary and the Order of the Christian Year have this advantage, that the individual taste of the minister is not allowed to lessen the pasture into which he leads his people. He may not find the selections edifying, but they do.

But we find suggested in the remarks of the *Advance* one or two points which we think escaped the notice of the writer. The writer, after praising certain books—viz., those of Dr. Green and Mr. Hungerford, very highly, complains that they have met with no general acceptance by the ministry or the churches. This, the *Advance* says, is from their want of flexibility. How flexibility can be wanting in a service where it is perfectly free to each officiating minister to use just as much or just as little as he likes we fail to see. It seems to us that coherence and stability are the points lacking. The essential point in the Prayer Book services is that the people always know what to do, and that when the service is varied, as it often is, in mission services, there is never any awkwardness, because the familiar principles of worship are always observed.

The radical defect (if it be a defect), in the independent form of service, is that it is put entirely into the minister's hands, and the people are receptive but unparticipant. His praying may be extempore, but their praying is just what he puts into their lips. It is a form, and only a form, and, what is worse in the way of formalism, it is a form dependent on his ability or caprice.

But again, there is a difficulty on the part of the ministry of the Congregationalists that they do not seek flexibility, but individuality. As long as a man is responsible in his own feeling and in the expectation of his people, for the shaping of the service he will try to shape it. He is thinking of what he ought to do instead of what ought to be done. Consequently, with any form which can be given him, his natural thought is not how he can use it, but how he can alter it.

Once more out of this very relation of the Congregationalist ministry to the people there comes the chief trouble. Any one who will examine the services of the Prayer Book will see that the first thought is of the thing to be done. Whether it be the daily service of morning and evening worship, the

administration of the sacraments, the burial of the dead, matrimony, confirmation, or ordination, the first thing sought is to express the act in view. Something is to be done; the first object of the service is to do this.

Then, around this central rite, whatever it be, are grouped certain features intended to develop its impressiveness and to make it edifying. But all these are strictly subordinated to the leading idea. The child is baptized, the couple are married, the dead is committed to the grave, the congregation worship, confess sins, utter praises, unite in prayers. Here is something which can be made flexible and to which flexibility is possible.

But this we can say to our Congregational friends, that their first need is to know what they have to do, and to do it. Then they can enrich their service. Now their eyes are fixed on the enrichment to the all but entire forgetfulness of that which is to be enriched.

## WITHOUT "SENSE, SCIENCE, OR SALVATION."

From *The Christian Advocate*, New York.

FOUR things are just now attracting special attention to the baleful delusion misnamed "*Christian Science*." Mrs. Plunkett, a priestess, considered by many the rival and probable successor of Mrs. Mary B. Eddy, the High-Priestess, spiritually divorced herself from her husband and spiritually married Worthington, alias Ward, etc., the hero of half a dozen bigamies, and the most unmitigated scoundrel that America could produce, and thus made a great deal of scandal. Mrs. Plunkett has played various rôles in different parts of the country. In Saratoga and in some of the "best families in this city" she has taught her doctrines, making her dupes believe that she had been an invalid for fifteen years, and that Christian Science had cured her. Many of the citizens of Detroit knew a great deal about her for many years before she began her career as a "healer," and are acquainted with her relation to a once distinguished citizen, and her attempt—still pending, as we believe—to collect a policy of insurance on his life in her favor, which suggest a state of things calculated to prevent surprise at these recent developments.

Much scandal has also been caused by the effects of Christian Science at Long Branch during the present season, where it has become a kind of craze in certain quarters.

The New York *Herald* has published various interviews on the subject which may be more or less exaggerated; but private information of a reliable character assures us that serious domestic discords have already been produced by it.

We would by no means affirm that all who believe in Christian Science are immoral; but that it is closely allied to the doctrine of affinities, liable to promote illicit attachments, and that it has already destroyed the peace of many families by intimacies which have arisen between female "Scientists" and male patients, and the reverse, we know, and therefore unhesitatingly affirm. This system of treatment requires privacy for its most successful operation, and makes use of a peculiar personal influence of the physician over the patient. It is therefore peculiarly adapted to be both a cover for and a stimulator of unholy alliances. Its doctrine of *sin* is perilously near, in many cases quite reaching the denial of the reality of it. The spiritual "medium" so often figuring in divorce cases and separations, and the "free lover" were not more dangerous than some of the practitioners of Christian Science.

Professors of Christianity, when opportunity concurred with allurements, and even those whose piety was genuine, like David and Peter, have fallen into awful wickedness. The difference, however, is that when Christians commit immorality it is in direct opposition to the teachings of the Gospel, and all who become aware of the fact denounce them as hypocrites. Except in a few cases, buttressed by unusual social, pecuniary, or ecclesiastical support, no minister thus denounced, or even generally suspected, is able to maintain himself. We repeat that we bring no charge against all practitioners of Christian Science, nor all believers in it, but point out a tendency, and affirm the existence of a considerable number of cases of the actual state warned against.

Another occasion for unusual notoriety is the taking of one of the local leaders to an Insane Asylum at Warren, Pa., and another to a similar institution at Newburg, O. These women have refused *medical aid*, and also have refused to *eat*. A refusal to eat is the logical outcome of their belief. There has never been anything more absurd than a refusal to use medicine on the ground that the spirit cannot be sick and still depending on food to prevent the sickness resulting from starvation. The insanity of a believer is, indeed, no proof of the falsity of a doctrine. Earnest Christians have become insane. The difference, however, is this:

the direct tendency of such superstitions as "Christian Science," *except where the tendency is antagonized by the practice of them for pay*, which tends mightily to keep the reason, is to the overthrow of mental balance; whereas intelligent obedience to the law of God and faith in His promises powerfully sustain the mind against all the moral and emotional troubles, as well as prevent the physical vices which are often the *exciting* causes of insanity, and tend to prevent the growth of those *predisposing* causes, without which the exciting would be comparatively harmless.

But a sensational article published by a syndicate of papers attempting to connect Bishop Newman with "Christian Science," to make it appear that he was not only privately a believer and supporter, but had publicly avowed his belief in "Christian Science," and had in a sermon declared it to be "advanced Christianity," has done more to make it the subject of conversation in the United States than all other things combined. Bishop Newman was probably the most widely-known public speaker in the United States after the death of Henry Ward Beecher and Bishop Simpson, unless Dr. Talmage equalled him in that particular, and his election as Bishop made his name known everywhere, since which he has travelled extensively in all parts of the country.

We thought it not worth while to notice this attempt till from all parts of the United States letters began to come stating that the article was doing Christianity much harm. We are now convinced, notwithstanding what has been said in the press generally, that it is necessary to state the facts here. The only questions are whether Bishop Newman believes in "Christian Science," and whether he has said anything in a sermon which would justify this charge.

As to the facts, then, Bishop Newman says that, in speaking in Des Moines, Iowa, he used the expression "Christian Science," and had no sooner done so than it flashed upon him that the expression might be abused, and he added: "Science touched by the genius of Christianity." He declares that the literature of "Christian Science" is a "literary pemmican of sense and nonsense;" that, so far as he knows, the lectures "are a series of vagaries which have little of sense, science, or salvation." He says "that they substitute one set of physicians for another and always with fees as large," and gives an account of his own practice in a manner which, for clearness,



discrimination, and force, it seems to us leaves nothing to be desired.

He then declares :

"It is also a perversion of privileges of Christian prayer and faith. The only Healer in the universe is Christ. His rule is to work through means ; when these fail He can work without them ; and He has reserved to Himself the right to work without them whenever He pleases. When I am ill I send for a learned physician, a trained nurse, and take all remedies prescribed with rational faith and Christian prayer."

When Mrs. Eddy first began to teach her views she did it with such an appearance of piety, and so glossed it with Christian phraseology, that several clergymen of note in Boston and of various denominations publicly indorsed her ; but when they discovered that she used words in a sense entirely different from that given to them in the Scriptures, and that her teachings would undermine Christianity, they were constrained to retract their indorsement.

## THE PROPOSAL FOR THE REVISION OF THE WESTMINSTER CONFSSION.

From *The Churchman*, New York.

PROFESSOR WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD contributes to the New York *Evangelist* a very able paper on the subject of the Revision of the Westminster Confession. He is decidedly opposed to any such step, and gives his reasons in full for this opposition. These reasons are of two kinds. One kind is founded on the general principle of conservatism, and these reasons are unanswerable in their abstract truth. If there is to be nothing settled in religion, if there is to be a perpetual reopening of questions, then sooner or later all religion resolves itself into the merest matter of speculation. The very essence of the idea of a revelation is, that it is made, is to be ascertained, and then is to stay, and to stay unchanged.

But the other part of Dr. Shedd's argument is not so sound. It is with the concrete application of his principle to the Westminster Confession that we take issue. Of course, from the Doctor's point of view the speculations, opinions, and, as he considers them, logical conclusions of the Westminster Confession are regarded as part of revealed truth. It is just here that the reasoning breaks down. These positions of the Confession may be true, as to that we have no concern, or they may be not true,

but true or false they have no place among the things necessary to be believed. The Creed of Christendom, that which can be required of a postulant for admission by baptism into the Christian Church, consists of facts—facts historical—once for all revealed. A past fact is not to be gainsaid. The most that can be done is to restate, for the sake of greater clearness of apprehension, facts which are of the essence of belief, as was done by the councils of Nice and Constantinople with the Apostles' Creed. These councils simply repeated the form of the faith received and held from the beginning in terms which guarded against later denials cunningly framed in ambiguous language. This is not to be changed.

But "views" in regard to God's sovereignty, irresistible decrees, election, and reprobation are not the Creed of Christendom. They are combated by many whom Dr. Shedd would receive into fullest fellowship.

Hence to keep these in that which is regarded as the "Creed" of Presbyterianism may be of importance to Presbyterians, just as the doctrine of ministerial parity may be, but there is no reason why Presbyterians should not change their views on these points, and when so changing, revise to any extent the formulas containing them. We fully concur with Dr. Shedd in the very important principle of holding fast to "the faith once delivered to the saints," but we wholly disagree with him in the belief that this faith is to be found in the Westminster Confession, or that this can be required of believers in general.

In fact, Dr. Shedd admits that it is not required of the Presbyterian laity to receive the statements of the Confession as to the doctrine of the decrees. It is enough for such weak-minded or "little-faith" brethren that they accept the Trinity and the Atonement, though more is desired of them. Now, there is no article of the Creed (the Apostles' as defined by the Nicene) which a communicant can be permitted to deny. There is no distinction of essentials and non-essentials, and this because all are facts and facts of especial importance, because hinging on the question of salvation in the Lord Jesus.

But there are hundreds of other facts which may be held or not, some as pious opinions, some as matters of controverted history. Whether the Mount of the Transfiguration was Tabor or Hermon, whether the term brothers of the Lord meant cousins or half-brothers, and twenty other points we could name are matters open to debate.

The facts of the Creed are not open, and

when a part of the Westminster Confession can be dispensed with as a condition of Christian membership, it is plain that the "Confession" is not and cannot be a "Creed."

## THE REVISION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CONFESSION.

*From The Christian Intelligencer, New York.*

It is a healthful sign that the Presbyterian Church has not only opened the question of the Revision of the Westminster Confession of Faith, but that the Church is considering it with so much earnestness. Whatever be the result as respects changes or modifications, the agitation will be healthful in stimulating attention to doctrine, and causing on the part of all an examination of standards, which it is very possible many in the Church have never even read. One effect already of the submission to the Presbyteries of the question as to whether any modification is desired, has been a great demand for "The Confession of Faith," which is being read more generally and carefully than ever before. This is well, since in this age, which lays so great emphasis on Christian activity, Christian belief, the only solid foundation of right doing has far too often been put into the background. There is in all Churches to-day a painful lack of indoctrination—few can give a clear statement of what they believe, and still fewer a reason for the faith they profess. Anything which will lead to careful examination and study of systematized doctrine cannot but be healthful.

The fact that the Presbyterian Church has not shrunk from a frank facing of the question whether its standards express the actual belief of its members or not, is in itself a token of life, and an evidence of faith in itself and its doctrinal position. Furthermore, the spirit in which the discussion is carried on assures that this testing of the foundations will do no harm.

The impression is prevalent that there has been, particularly within the Calvinistic Churches, a gradual drifting away from the tenets of the Fathers, and that great fundamental changes need to be made to conform the Reformation Standards to the belief of to-day. It is already apparent that within the Presbyterian Church at least this is not the case. The changes demanded by the most liberal will be very few, and concern expressions, more than essentials. The inquiry will show that there is no demand for

a surrender of the Calvinistic system of doctrine, or weakening as to the divine sovereignty and salvation by grace, but merely a closer conforming of the expression of these doctrines to Scripture teaching and the Church's belief. It is to be hoped that a false conservatism, which scents danger in any change, may not interpose to prevent the modification of expressions, which themselves need explanation, and unless explained, convey to the average mind an erroneous idea of what the Church really believes. There are such in the Westminster Confession—even though they be few—and the interest of the truth, to say nothing of the Church, requires that they be removed. In some way they will be.

The duty of the Church to keep its written Confession in accord with its real beliefs is imperative. What President Gates says in another column respecting the importance of accord between the laws and life of the people in a State, is even more important in the Church.

The expressions that need revision do not, we may remark, primarily burden the consciences of members or ministers within the Presbyterian Church. Subscription to the standards—acceptance of the Confession of Faith—is not required of a person in order to membership. It is sufficient to have faith in Christ and yield one's self to the instruction of the Church and use its means of grace.

The ministers and officers of the Presbyterian Church of this country likewise only subscribe to the Confession of Faith as "containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures," and are hence relieved of the burden which is felt by their brethren in Scotland and England, where the terms of subscription are more exacting. The thing needed here is the protection of the Church's system of doctrine from needless reproach and misrepresentation through the reading of the Confession where there is and can be no explanation of the sense in which the words are understood. That the Church has suffered from just this cause, is pithily presented by the orthodox and well-informed editor of the *Herald and Presbyterian*, as follows:

"The senior editor of the *Herald and Presbyterian* has lived long enough . . . to know that the Cumberland Presbyterians, by ringing the changes on the alleged fatalism of our standards, have built up a so-called Presbyterian Church as large as the Southern Presbyterian Church; long enough to know that the Methodist circuit-riders, with our Confession in their saddle-

bags as a text-book, especially in the central and Western sections of our country, where we and the Baptists had the field, now have churches and members outnumbering both; long enough to know that New England, which at first accepted the Westminster Standards, had to modify them for self-preservation; long enough to know that the Confession of the Westminster Assembly is no longer 'pure and simple,' but has already been amended by us and other Churches without sacrilege, and may be again with impunity; long enough to know that something is needed, and must come; but not quite long enough to know precisely what is best, whether 'a declarative act,' or a new Confession, or a revision of what we have, the probability, at present, being in favor of the latter; but he does not expect 'to live long enough' to see any change that will impair the integrity of the Calvinistic system of doctrine."

Whether relief from the difficulty will be best secured by explanatory articles, such as the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland have adopted, or by a revision of the Confession itself, such as the English Church is engaged on, we, as our brother of the *Herald and Presbyter*, do not venture to affirm, but we are clear something in this direction is called for, and if attained will be not only helpful to the Presbyterian Church, but all Churches holding to the Calvinistic and Reformed system of doctrine. The correct principle and the one to which we apprehend the Church will come is well formulated in the action of the Presbytery of Cincinnati:

"Resolved, That Presbytery is not in favor of any revision of the Confession of Faith which would impair the integrity of our doctrinal system, but favor such change as will set forth more clearly the doctrines therein contained and remove any just grounds of misapprehension or criticism."

The principle will doubtless be generally accepted; the difficulty will be in the application of it. As to this, too, we have faith there will come to be substantial and general agreement.

## ENGLISH BISHOPS ON BROTHERHOODS.

From *The Churchman*, New York.

SIX bishops of the Church of England have been asked to formulate their opinions as to the advisability of reviving the monastic life in England, in the shape of brother-

hoods, and it is remarkable that each of these representative men seems averse to decide that the scheme is either impracticable or undesirable. That an unqualified indorsement of methods which are not yet reduced to detail and proved by experiment has not been given in the utterances of these leaders of the Church is not surprising. The Archbishop of Canterbury, who is an enthusiast in the best sense of the word, refuses a decided opinion about projects and plans which are at present so indefinite. Bishop King thinks the scheme likely to be very useful. Bishop Temple has seen the desolation and degradation of the London poor, and concurs in the opinion expressed in the report. The Bishop of Winchester, the learned Dr. Harold Browne, almost echoes the words of Dr. Benson. Perhaps the most valuable opinion of all is that of the Bishop of Chester, Dr. Jayne. The experience of this eminent clergyman in the great parish of Leeds has rendered him capable of forming a judgment at once upon such a matter as this, and of pointing out the dangers to which the revival of brotherhoods in the Church of England is likely to be exposed. Bishop Jayne asserts that such an association of workers as is contemplated is likely to lead to a centralization of parochial energies, such as nowadays is being lost in the division and subdivision of parishes and the dissipation of ministerial forces at scattered points. The Bishop of Chester recollects from history how the regular and the parochial clergy waged with each other something like an internecine war. Human nature likes to be paid back for its sacrifices by some sort of distinction and prestige. The bishop deprecates anything like such a spirit among "the pioneers" of revived monasticism as would lead them to imagine "that they are going to work wonders and be the *élite* of the Church of England." Any such spirit as this will, in Bishop Jayne's judgment, destroy the reality and power of the movement. If modesty and humility, if the spirit of loyalty and proportion be not the ruling spirit of the new scheme, "the virtue will go out of it." It must be begun "without flourish of trumpets."

These wise words are much needed in a feverish, excited, and enthusiastic crisis, such as convocation has created by its recent action touching the present subject. Perhaps they teach the hardest and the most important lesson to be learned with regard to the scheme, and the only lesson which will preserve the scheme from the canker of pharisaism and fanaticism.



## THE ORIGIN AND THE USE OF THE CREED.

BY B. A. HINSDALE.

From *The Christian Standard*, Cincinnati.

THE creeds of the second and third centuries are growths or developments, what one trained in the school of natural history might call arrested growths; and the germ is the primitive confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

If the reader will analyze the primitive creeds he will see that they all consist of three principal articles or parts: one relating to God, one to Christ, and the third to the Holy Spirit. How, then, were confessions containing three articles evolved from confessions containing but one? The answer is not far to seek. A second New Testament form is the baptismal formula, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." What may be called the enacting clause of the creeds, "I believe," was suggested by the formula uttered by Peter and approved by our Lord; and its tripartite form was furnished by the formula used at baptism. Perhaps the process cannot better be described than to say the soul of the one formula was poured into the body of the other. The term "creed," derived from the first word of the so-called Apostles' Creed, in the Latin *credo*, "I believe." Probably the doxologies of the epistles, such as "Grace be unto you, and peace from God our father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ," contributed something to the stability of the form. Because only the divinity of Jesus is included in the primitive confession, it does not at all follow that it was the only article of Christian teaching and belief. This confession takes for granted the existence of God, which, as Dr. Barrow has well said, "is the foundation of all religion, the support of all virtue, the principal article in all the creeds of all the world." Then was the less need of putting belief in God in the Apostolic Confession from the fact that all the Jews, to whom the Gospel was first preached, were thoroughly grounded in that faith. At least, so reasoned the ancient Church. Whether the divinity of the Holy Spirit was distinctly perceived by the first disciples I do not pretend to say; the doctrine seems to be clearly taught in the New Testament; and probably the creed article relating to Him is as old as the one relating to God the Father.

It is not for one moment probable that

the creeds found in Irenæus, Tertullian, and Origen were the first ones, although they are the oldest that have been preserved. To suppose the Christian consciousness passed by a single leap from the confession of Peter to the confessions of a century and a half later sets at defiance all the analogies of nature and history. That would be to expect the ear—I do not say the full corn in the ear—when there had been no stalk. It is probable that there were creeds in general use which have not been preserved. These creeds, no doubt, appeared in many places nearly simultaneously, produced by the same causes and shaped by the same conditions. The materials of which they were composed have been described above, and they ran somewhat as follows: "I believe in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ the Son, and in the Holy Ghost." This is the framework or skeleton of all the creeds, earlier and later. All the rest of their substance, with the sole exception of the article relating to the Church found in some of them, is but the flesh with which the skeleton is clothed. When this form first appeared no one can say; but it is safe to conclude that the first article was not added to the primitive confession until the struggle between Christianity and paganism had become very distinctly defined. This original creed was neither a conventional nor an individual act; it was not the work of the apostles nor of any one of them; it was the production of the general Church consciousness stimulated by the ministry. Dr. Shedd says: "The Apostles' Creed is the earliest attempt of the Christian mind to systematize the teachings of Scripture." I should rather say that it must have been preceded by more than two centuries by a much simpler one.

If it be charged that this view be hypothetical, I reply that this original creed is not indeed preserved in the remains of Christian antiquity, but that its existence is fairly inferable from all the premises, and that this conclusion is supported by a multitude of analogies in history and nature. Besides, there seems to be traces of it in some of the Fathers. Thus, Cyril of Alexandria says: "Christ offers one confession, that is faith; which we are also accustomed rightly to make, saying we believe in God the Father Almighty, and in one Lord Jesus Christ his Son, and in the Holy Ghost." And once more: "There is made by us the confession of the right faith in our God the Father Almighty, and in one Lord Jesus Christ his Son, and in one Holy Ghost." There is also a passage in Tertullian of simi-

lar import. Speaking of the Holy Spirit as the "leader into all truth," he adds, "which, according to the *Christian sacrament*, is in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost." These quotations do not prove that there was so brief a symbol as this extant in the days of Cyril and Tertullian, but they show that which these writers understand the substance of the Confession to be, and probably point to a form that came between the apostolic Confession and the expanded tripartite creeds of the fourth century.

But perhaps the strongest proof of the existence of such a symbol is that furnished by the perfect explanation it gives of the development of the later forms. As soon as we gain this point of view, all difficulty is overcome. The creed of the Ancient Church is an evolution as much as a fish or a flower—an evolution effected by the forces and moulded by the conditions set down in previous articles. The primitive Confession is the seed—the lost Creed is the blade—the creeds of the second and third centuries are the corn—while the full corn we will call the symbol adopted at Nicea in 325.

Once more, the first differentiation produces the three articles, I believe in God, in Christ, and the Holy Spirit. Each of these three differentiated divisions soon begins to exhibit some differentiation of parts; and these secondary differentiations go on until the perfected symbol is produced. Thus, God is described as "the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth," the Son as "the only Son our Lord, conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary," etc.

But it may be asked, why were these new particulars added? Specific answer to this inquiry cannot be here given. It is sufficient to say the theological mind was seeking to do what the rabbis would call building a "fence" about the Gospel. In other words, the new articles were the answers of the orthodox to various false doctrines set afloat by heretics. They were added to make the badge or token of discipleship more distinctive.

Before dismissing the subject, it should be remarked that those Christians who hold strongly to tradition seek the origin of the historic Creed outside of the Scriptures altogether. They consider it a part of the traditional doctrine so stoutly contended for by Romanists and by some Protestants. My view is that the Creed was produced by the mind of the Church working under given conditions on the teachings of Scripture; that it was the result of a theological effort. It is quite true that the Gospel was

first preached, then written; that the Word preached was orally transmitted for a full century side by side with the evangelical narratives; but that the oral Gospel contained distinctive features not in the written is not probable. This early tradition and the written word were the same in substance.

A second use made of the Creed was in the instruction of catechumens. For reasons that she deemed sufficient, the Church early abandoned the primitive practice of admitting the penitent believer at once to confession and baptism. He was subjected to a special preparatory instruction and training, called his catechuminate. The summary of doctrine found in the Creed admirably served the purpose of this instruction. However, there is reason to suppose that it was so used only in the later period of this discipline. The catechumens were divided into classes, and the symbol seems, at least in some cases, to have been studiously concealed from the lower class. St. Ambrose writes that on a Lord's day the lessons and sermons being ended, and the catechumens of the lower rank being dismissed, that then in the baptistery of the church, he delivered the symbol to some of the *competentes*, or the higher rank of catechumens.

A third and later use of the Creed was made in the public worship. When liturgical worship became prevalent, the Creed was naturally inserted in the liturgy. Special historical illustration is not called for; but it is proper to remark that those churches which employ creeds and liturgies still preserve this custom.

The view herein given of the origin of the Creed is similar in several features to the one proposed by Lord King. "As for the authors thereof, it cannot be denied but that they were several and many; the Creed was neither the work of one man nor of one day, but during a long tract of time passed successively through several hands ere it arrived at its present perfection; the composition of it was gradual and not instantaneous."

The original significance of confession has been sufficiently set forth already. As early as the time of Tertullian the confession was called the Christian sacrament. St. Ambrose called it *militis sacramentum*, the oath of the Christian soldier. The primitive confessions and the later creeds alike were used as solemn interrogations at baptism. Justin Martyr assures us "that none were baptized unless they did first declare their assent to the doctrine and faith

of the Gospel." Another ancient writer says that those who came to the sacred laver of regeneration confessed, saying, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ, his only Son, and in the Holy Ghost." Rufinus relates that in his time at Rome the ancient custom of persons about to be baptized publicly to recite the Creed was still retained. How soon the Creed became so stereotyped that a prescribed form of words were recited by the confessor, as is generally the case now in orthodox churches, no one can tell; but I see no reason to suppose that such was the state of things in the time of Irenæus and Tertullian. The fluency of the Creed in their hands would seem to forbid such a supposition. No doubt, for a long time the minister asserted a large liberty in the choice of words, but the tendency for religious formulæ and rites to become fixed and rigid finally prevailed.

## I.

## ON AGNOSTICISM.

*A Paper Read at the Manchester Church Congress,  
1888.*

BY HENRY WACE, D.D.,

PREBENDARY OF ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL; PRINCIPAL OF  
KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON.

[We propose to reprint, in serial form, the recent papers by Principal Henry Wace, D.D., Professor Huxley, Rt. Rev. Dr. Magee, Mr. W. H. Mallock, and Mrs. Humphry Ward, on Christianity and Agnosticism, which are a valuable and permanent contribution to a great controversy. The fact that the reprint in book form put upon the American market was so eagerly bought up that the edition was quickly exhausted shows the widespread interest in the discussion, and induces us to believe that many will thank us for thus putting the papers in their hands.—ED.]

WHAT is agnosticism? In the new Oxford "Dictionary of the English Language," we are told that "an agnostic is one who holds that the existence of anything beyond and behind natural phenomena is unknown, and (so far as can be judged) unknowable, and especially that a First Cause and an unseen world are subjects of which we know nothing." The same authority quotes a letter from Mr. R. H. Hutton, stating that the word was suggested in his hearing, at a party held in 1869, by Professor Huxley, who took it from St. Paul's mention of the altar at Athens to the Unknown God. "Agnostic," it is further said, in a passage quoted from the *Spectator* of June 11th, 1876, "was the name demanded by Professor Huxley for those who disclaimed atheism, and believed with him in an unknown

and unknowable God, or, in other words, that the ultimate origin of all things must be some cause unknown and unknowable." Again, the late honored bishop of this diocese is quoted as saying, in the *Manchester Guardian*, in 1880, that "the agnostic neither denied nor affirmed God. He simply put him on one side." The designation was suggested, therefore, for the purpose of avoiding a direct denial of beliefs respecting God such as are asserted by our faith. It proceeds, also, from a scientific source, and claims the scientific merit, or habit, of reserving opinion respecting matters not known or proved.

Now we are not here concerned with this doctrine as a mere question of abstract philosophy respecting the limits of our natural capacities. We have to consider it in relation to the Church and to Christianity, and the main consideration which it is the purpose of this paper to suggest is that, in this relation, the adoption of the term agnostic is only an attempt to shift the issue, and that it involves a mere evasion. A Christian Catechism says: "First, I learn to believe in God the Father, who hath made me, and all the world; secondly, in God the Son, who hath redeemed me, and all mankind; thirdly, in God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me, and all the elect people of God." The agnostic says: "How do you know all that? I consider I have no means of knowing these things you assert respecting God. I do not know, and cannot know, that God is a Father, and that he has a Son; and I do not and cannot know that such a Father made me, or that such a Son redeemed me." But the Christian did not speak of what he knew, but of what he believed. The first word of a Christian is not "I know," but "I believe." He professes, not a science, but a faith; and at baptism he accepts, not a theory, but a creed.

Now it is true that in one common usage of the word, belief is practically equivalent to opinion. A man may say he believes in a scientific theory, meaning that he is strongly of opinion that it is true; or, in still looser language, he may say he believes it is going to be a fine day. I would observe, in passing, that even in this sense of the word, a man who refused to act upon what he could not know would be a very unpractical person. If you are suffering from an obscure disease, you go to a doctor to obtain, not his knowledge of your malady, but his opinion; and upon that opinion, in defiance of other opinions, even an emperor may have to stake his life. Similar-



ly, from what is known of the proceedings in Parliament respecting the Manchester Ship-Canal, it may be presumed that engineers were not unanimous as to the possibilities and advantages of that undertaking; but Manchester men were content to act upon the best opinion, and to stake fortunes on their belief in it. However, it may be sufficient to have just alluded to the old and unanswered contention of Bishop Butler that, even if Christian belief and Christian duty were mere matters of probable opinion, a man who said in regard to them, "I do not know, and therefore I will not act," would be abandoning the first principle of human energy. He might be a philosopher; but he would not be a man—not at least, I fancy, according to the standard of Lancashire.

But there is another sense of the word "belief," which is of far more importance for our present subject. There is belief which is founded on the assurances of another person, and upon our trust in him. This sort of belief is not opinion, but faith; and it is this which has been the greatest force in creating religions, and through them in moulding civilizations. What made the Mohammedan world? Trust and faith in the declarations and assurances of Mohammed. And what made the Christian world? Trust and faith in the declarations and assurances of Jesus Christ and his apostles. This is not mere believing about things; it is believing a man and believing in a man. Now, the point of importance for the present argument is, that the chief articles of the Christian creed are directly dependent on personal assurances and personal declarations, and that our acceptance of them depends on personal trust. Why do we believe that Jesus Christ redeemed all mankind? Because he said so. There is no other ultimate ground for it. The matter is not one open to the observation of our faculties; and as a matter of science we are not in a position to know it. The case is the same with his divine Sonship and the office of his Spirit. He reveals himself by his words and acts; and in revealing himself he reveals his Father, and the Spirit who proceeds from both. His resurrection and his miracles afford us, as St. Paul says, assurance of his divine mission. But for our knowledge of his offices in relation to mankind, and of his nature in relation to God, we rest on his own words, confirmed and explained by those of his apostles. Who can dream of knowing, as a matter of science, that he is the Judge of quick and dead? But he speaks himself, in the Ser-

mon on the Mount, of that day when men will plead before him, and when he will decide their fate; and Christians include in their creed a belief in that statement respecting the unseen and future world.

But if this be so, for a man to urge as an escape from this article of belief that he has no means of a scientific knowledge of the unseen world, or of the future, is irrelevant. His difference from Christians lies not in the fact that he has no knowledge of these things, but that he does not believe the authority on which they are stated. He may prefer to call himself an agnostic; but his real name is an older one—he is an infidel: that is to say, an unbeliever. The word infidel, perhaps, carries an unpleasant significance. Perhaps it is right that it should. It is, and it ought to be, an unpleasant thing for a man to have to say plainly that he does not believe Jesus Christ. It is, indeed, an awful thing to say. But even men who are not conscious of all it involves shrink from the ungraciousness, if from nothing more, of treating the beliefs inseparably associated with that sacred Person as an illusion. This, however, is what is really meant by agnosticism; and the time seems to have come when it is necessary to insist upon the fact.

Of course, there may be numberless attempts at respectful excuses or evasions, and there is one in particular which may require notice. It may be asked how far we can rely on the accounts we possess of our Lord's teaching on these subjects. Now it is unnecessary for the general argument before us to enter on those questions respecting the authenticity of the Gospel narratives, which ought to be regarded as settled by M. Renan's practical surrender of the adverse case. Apart from all disputed points of criticism, no one practically doubts that our Lord lived, and that he died on the cross, in the most intense sense of filial relation to his Father in heaven, and that he bore testimony to that Father's providence, love, and grace toward mankind. The Lord's Prayer affords sufficient evidence upon these points. If the Sermon on the Mount alone be added, the whole unseen world, of which the agnostic refuses to know anything, stands unveiled before us. There you see revealed the divine Father and Creator of all things, in personal relation to his creatures, hearing their prayers, witnessing their actions, caring for them and rewarding them. There you hear of a future judgment administered by Christ himself, and of a heaven to be hereafter revealed, in which those who live as the children of that

Father, and who suffer in the cause and for the sake of Christ himself, will be abundantly rewarded. If Jesus Christ preached that sermon, made those promises, and taught that prayer, then any one who says that we know nothing of God, or of a future life, or of an unseen world, says that he does not believe Jesus Christ. Since the days when our Lord lived and taught, at all events, agnosticism has been impossible without infidelity.

Let it be observed, moreover, that to put the case in this way is not merely to make an appeal to authority. It goes further than that. It is in a vital respect an appeal to experience, and so far to science itself. It is an appeal to what I hope may be taken as, confessedly, the deepest and most sacred moral experience which has ever been known. No criticism worth mentioning doubts the story of the Passion; and that story involves the most solemn attestation, again and again, of truths of which an agnostic coolly says he knows nothing. An agnosticism which knows nothing of the relation of man to God must not only refuse belief to our Lord's most undoubted teaching, but must deny the reality of the spiritual convictions in which he lived and died. It must declare that his most intimate, most intense beliefs, and his dying aspirations, were an illusion. Is that supposition tolerable? It is because it is not tolerable that men would fain avoid facing it, and would have themselves called agnostics rather than infidels; but I know not whether this cool and supercilious disregard of that solemn teaching, and of that sacred life and death, be not more offensive than the downright denials which look their responsibility boldly in the face, and say, not only that they do not know, but that they do not believe. This question of living faith in a living God and Saviour, with all it involves, is too urgent and momentous a thing to be put aside with a philosophical "I don't know." The best blood of the world has been shed over it; the deepest personal, social, and even political problems are still bound up with it. The intensest moral struggles of humanity have centred round this question, and it is really intolerable that all this bitter experience of men and women who have trusted and prayed, and suffered and died, in faith, should be set aside as not germane to a philosophical argument.

But, to say the least, from a purely scientific point of view, there is a portentous fallacy in the manner in which, in agnostic arguments, the testimony, not only of our

Lord, but of psalmists, prophets, apostles, and saints is disregarded. So far as the Christian faith can be treated as a scientific question, it is a question of experience; and what is to be said of a science which leaves out of account the most conspicuous and most influential experience in the matter? One thing may be said with confidence: that it defeats itself, by disregarding the greatest force with which it has to contend.

While philosophers are arguing as to the abstract capacities of human thought, as though our Lord had never lived and died, he himself is still speaking; his words, as recorded by his apostles and evangelists, are still echoing over human hearts, touching their inmost affections, appealing to their deepest needs, commanding their profoundest trust, and awakening in them an apprehension of that divine relation and those unseen realities in which their spirits live. While agnostics are committing the enormous scientific as well as moral blunder of considering the relations of men to God and to an unseen world without taking his evidence into account, and then presuming to judge the faith he taught by their own partial knowledge, his word is still heard, in penetrating and comfortable words, bidding men believe in God and believe also in himself. He, after all, is the one sufficient answer to agnosticism, and—I will take the liberty of adding—to atheism and to pessimism also. Not merely his authority, though that would be enough, but his life, his soul, himself.

Accordingly, as our object here is to consider how to deal with these difficulties and objections, what these considerations would seem to point out is that we should take care to let Christ and Christ's own message be heard, and not to endure that they should be allowed to stand aside while a philosophical debate is proceeding. Philosophers are slow in these matters. They are still disputing, after some twenty-five hundred years of discussion, what is the true principle for determining moral right and wrong. Meanwhile men have been content to live by the Ten Commandments, and the main lines of duty are plain. In the same way religion has preceded the philosophy of religion, and men can be made sensible of their relation to God whether it can be philosophically explained or not. The Psalms, the Prophets, and, above all, the Gospels, are plain evidence, in matter of fact, that men are in relation to God and owe duties to him. Let men be made to attend to the facts; let them hear those simple, plain, and earnest witnesses; above all,



let them hear the voice of Christ, and they will at least believe whatever may be the possibilities of knowledge. In a word, let us imitate St. Paul when his converts were perplexed by Greek philosophies at Corinth: "I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God; for I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified."

## II.

### AGNOSTICISM.

BY PROF. THOMAS H. HUXLEY.

WITHIN the last few months the public has received much and varied information on the subject of agnostics, their tenets, and even their future. Agnosticism exercised the orators of the Church Congress at Manchester.\* It has been furnished with a set of "articles" fewer, but not less rigid, and certainly not less consistent than the thirty-nine; its nature has been analyzed, and its future severely predicted by the most eloquent of that prophetic school whose Samuel is Auguste Comte. It may still be a question, however, whether the public is as much the wiser as might be expected, considering all the trouble that has been taken to enlighten it. Not only are the three accounts of the agnostic position sadly out of harmony with one another, but I propose to show cause for my belief that all three must be seriously questioned by any one who employs the term "agnostic" in the sense in which it was originally used. The learned principal of King's College, who brought the topic of agnosticism before the Church Congress, took a short and easy way of settling the business:

But if this be so, for a man to urge, as an escape from this article of belief, that he has no means of a scientific knowledge of the unseen world, or of the future, is irrelevant. His difference from Christians lies not in the fact that he has no knowledge of these things, but that he does not believe the authority on which they are stated. He may prefer to call himself an agnostic; but his real name is an older one—he is an infidel; that is to say, an unbeliever. The word infidel, perhaps, carries an unpleasant significance. Perhaps it is right that it should. It is, and it ought to be, an unpleasant thing for a man to have to say plainly that he does not believe in Jesus Christ.

And in the course of the discussion which followed, the Bishop of Peterborough departed so far from his customary courtesy and self-respect as to speak of "cowardly agnosticism" (p. 262).

So much of Dr. Wace's address either explicitly or implicitly concerns me, that I take upon myself to deal with it; but, in so doing, it must be understood that I speak for myself alone; I am not aware that there is any sect of Agnostics; and if there be, I am not its acknowledged prophet or pope. I desire to leave to the Comtists the entire monopoly of the manufacture of imitation ecclesiasticism.

Let us calmly and dispassionately consider Dr. Wace's appreciation of agnosticism. The agnostic, according to his view, is a person who says he has no means of attaining a scientific knowledge of the unseen world or of the future; by which somewhat loose phraseology Dr. Wace presumably means the theological unseen world and future. I cannot think this description happy either in form or substance, but for the present it may pass. Dr. Wace continues, that is not "his difference from Christians." Are there, then, any Christians who say that they know nothing about the unseen world and the future? I was ignorant of the fact, but I am ready to accept it on the authority of a professional theologian, and I proceed to Dr. Wace's next proposition.

The real state of the case, then, is that the agnostic "does not believe the authority" on which "these things" are stated, which authority is Jesus Christ. He is simply an old-fashioned "infidel," who is afraid to own to his right name. As "Presbyter is priest writ large," so is "agnostic" the mere Greek equivalent for the Latin "infidel." There is an attractive simplicity about this solution of the problem; and it has that advantage of being somewhat offensive to the persons attacked, which is so dear to the less refined sort of controversialist. The agnostic says, "I cannot find good evidence that so and so is true." "Ah," says his adversary, seizing his opportunity, "then you declare that Jesus Christ was untruthful, for he said so and so;" a very telling method of rousing prejudice. But suppose that the value of the evidence as to what Jesus may have said and done, and as to the exact nature and scope of his authority, is just that which the agnostic finds it most difficult to determine? If I venture to doubt that the Duke of Wellington gave the command, "Up, Guards, and at 'em!" at Waterloo, I do not think that

\* See the "Official Report of the Church Congress held at Manchester," October, 1888, pp. 253, 254.



even Dr. Wace would accuse me of disbelieving the duke. Yet it would be just as reasonable to do this as to accuse any one of denying what Jesus said before the preliminary question as to what he did say is settled.

Now, the question as to what Jesus really said and did is strictly a scientific problem, which is capable of solution by no other methods than those practised by the historian and the literary critic. It is a problem of immense difficulty, which has occupied some of the best heads in Europe for the last century; and it is only of late years that their investigations have begun to converge toward one conclusion.\*

That kind of faith which Dr. Wace describes and lauds is of no use here. Indeed, he himself takes pains to destroy its evidential value.

"What made the Mohammedan world? Trust and faith in the declarations and assurances of Mohammed. And what made the Christian world? Trust and faith in the declarations and assurances of Jesus Christ and his apostles" (*loc. cit.*, p. 253). The triumphant tone of this imaginary catechism leads me to suspect that its author has hardly appreciated its full import. Presumably, Dr. Wace regards Mohammed as an unbeliever, or, to use the term which he prefers, infidel; and considers that his assurances have given rise to a vast delusion, which has led, and is leading, millions of men straight to everlasting punishment. And this being so, the "trust and faith" which have "made the Mohammedan world," in just the same sense as they have "made the Christian world," must be trust and faith in falsehood. No man who has studied history, or even attended to the occurrences of every-day life, can doubt the enormous practical value of trust and faith; but as little will he be inclined to deny that this practical value has not the least relation to the reality of the objects of that trust and faith. In examples of patient constancy of faith and of unswerving trust,

the "Acta Martyrum" do not excel the annals of Babism.

The discussion upon which we have now entered goes so thoroughly to the root of the whole matter; the question of the day is so completely, as the author of "Robert Elsmere" says, the value of testimony, that I shall offer no apology for following it out somewhat in detail; and, by way of giving substance to the argument, I shall base what I have to say upon a case, the consideration of which lies strictly within the province of natural science, and of that particular part of it known as the physiology and pathology of the nervous system.

I find, in the second Gospel (chap. 5), a statement, to all appearance intended to have the same evidential value as any other contained in that history. It is the well-known story of the devils who were cast out of a man, and ordered, or permitted, to enter into a herd of swine, to the great loss and damage of the innocent Gerasene, or Gadarene, pig-owners. There can be no doubt that the narrator intends to convey to his readers his own conviction that this casting out and entering in were effected by the agency of Jesus of Nazareth; that, by speech and action, Jesus enforced this conviction; nor does any inkling of the legal and moral difficulties of the case manifest itself.

On the other hand, everything that I know of physiological and pathological science leads me to entertain a very strong conviction that the phenomena ascribed to possession are as purely natural as those which constitute small-pox; everything that I know of anthropology leads me to think that the belief in demons and demoniacal possession is a mere survival of a once universal superstition, and that its persistence at the present time is pretty much in the inverse ratio of the general instruction, intelligence, and sound judgment of the population among whom it prevails. Everything that I know of law and justice convinces me that the wanton destruction of other people's property is a misdemeanor of evil example. Again, the study of history, and especially of that of the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, leaves no shadow of doubt on my mind that the belief in the reality of possession and of witchcraft, justly based, alike by Catholics and Protestants, upon this and innumerable other passages in both the Old and New Testaments, gave rise, through the special influence of Christian ecclesiastics, to the most horrible persecutions and judicial murders of thousands upon thousands of innocent men, women, and children. And when I reflect that the record of a plain and simple declaration upon such an occasion as this, that the belief in witchcraft and possession is wicked nonsense, would have rendered the long agony of mediæval humanity impossible, I am prompted to reject, as dishonoring, the supposition that such declaration was withheld out of condescension to popular error.

(To be continued.)

\* Dr. Wace tells us, "It may be asked how far we can rely on the accounts we possess of our Lord's teaching on these subjects." And he seems to think the question appropriately answered by the assertion that it "ought to be regarded as settled by M. Renan's practical surrender of the adverse case." I thought I knew M. Renan's works pretty well, but I have contrived to miss this "practical" (I wish Dr. Wace had defined the scope of that useful adjective) surrender. However, as Dr. Wace can find no difficulty in pointing out the passage of M. Renan's writings, by which he feels justified in making his statement, I shall wait for further enlightenment, contenting myself, for the present, with remarking that if M. Renan were to retract and do penance in Notre Dame to-morrow for any contributions to Biblical criticism that may be specially his property, the main results of that criticism as they are set forth in the works of Strauss, Baur, Reuss, and Volkmar, for example, would not be sensibly affected.

## PARAGRAPHIC.

A RELIGIOUS newspaper speaks very severely of the effects of the recent vacation. Its terms seem to imply that not only Church work has been suspended, but religion dead in the land during the hot weather. There is something shocking in the words, "Church work, which has been suspended, *i.e.*, by the vacation for weeks, will begin anew, and soon we shall be hard at it, serving the Lord, in revivals of religion."

Has religion been killed by the dog-days that it has to be revived and brought to life again at the Equinox? Yet we read that some days ago "it was impossible to find a Protestant minister in Waterbury, Conn., a city of 30,000 inhabitants, to perform a marriage ceremony."

What consolation, then, would there be for the dying and the sick in Waterbury, Conn.? For our own part, we do not believe that religion disappears with the frosts, that Church work ceases when the birds begin to sing, or that any city in the Union of 30,000 people was ever without a "Protestant" minister at least within easy call.—*N. Y. Churchman*.

THE origin of the name Chautauqua is said to be the exclamation of the Indian chief who, driven to desperation by the energetic tongue of his squaw, plunged headlong into the lake, exclaiming, as he went, "she talk away, she talk away." There is a terrible suspicion that the ghost of the old squaw still haunts the shades of Chautauqua, and bewitches the tongues of not otherwise speakers.—*N. Y. Observer*.

SALVATION ARMY.—Boothism is but another of the excrescences which caricature the face of much of modern Christianity. It has receded from its professed undenominationalism, it has done little or nothing to break through the inert mass of practical heathenism, and it has unsettled many who were quietly pursuing the old paths. A letter which Mr. Llewellyn Davis wrote in the *Times* very trenchantly deals more particularly with the second of these assertions. Mr. Davis speaks from intimate knowledge of the facts derived from exceptional opportunities, and he declares without hesitation that the work of the "Army," in that district at least where his own church is situated, is a distinct failure. He failed, as others failed, to secure the names of any genuine converts from the class for which the "Army" was presumed to be started. Many persons of religious character and susceptible dispositions were attracted to it, but none, permanently from the uncared-for and disreputable classes whose exclusive champion Mr. Booth tried to prove himself before Mr. Matthews. It is time that this miserable travesty of religion should be put to the test, and that the philanthropic people who so largely support its peculiar methods should understand that the work which Mr. Booth is doing is a work of destruction, not of construction, and that the amelioration of the outcast and poor of London is going on steadily through the old-fashioned agencies, not by means of this newest of shams.—*The Church Times*.

In discussing the death penalty, the *New York Observer* has given to the public an expression worthy of being printed in every paper in the United States. It says: "Abolishing the death penalty does not indicate an increase of the sense of the sacredness of human life, but exactly the contrary. It is a great appreciation of the value of the criminal's life, and a comparatively small appreciation

of the value of the life of his victims."—*The Christian Advocate*.

PROFESSOR WIGGINS, after prophesying falsely for several years, has struck a coincidence in this year. He certainly said this would be a year of dire disasters and calamity by fire, floods, and cyclones, and already 15,000 lives, as an exchange notes, and property to \$100,000,000 have been destroyed by these agents. No matter what a man predicts, all he has to do is to keep on long enough in this changeful world and he will hit it, and he can rely on the fools to forget the failures and go wild with wonder or delight when his one coincidence arrives.—*The Christian Advocate*.

WHILE some Christians complain that they can find no opportunity to do good, others are embarrassed because of the multitude of inviting openings, only a few of which they can find time to enter. The difference between these two classes of Christians is not in their circumstances, but in their spiritual discernment. Some men are blind to their opportunities. They stand idle all the day, while the fields are white already to the harvest. They can see how others may be useful, but no work seems suited to their abilities. If the eyes of idle Christians could once be opened, they would be as much surprised as Elisha's servant was when he saw the mountains covered with the horses and chariots of God.—*The Christian Advocate*.

It has been urged that we ought to love our neighbor upon earth as we shall love him in heaven; but duty and ability do not go hand in hand. When we meet in the better land, we will have more power to love, and both our neighbor and ourselves will have grown more lovely. We must do our best here, however, to reach the heavenly standard.—*The Interior*.

WE all know that worry kills. Unfortunately it only kills the worried. The worrier thrives: like symbolic Jeshurun he waxes fat and kicks in a lively fashion. Here is a case of the survival of the unfittest.—*Christian at Work*.

FULLER says that illustrations are the windows, and arguments the pillars of a discourse. A Roman Catholic priest in Victoria recently exhibited his skill in pulpit illustration in a remarkable way. He took a walnut into the pulpit and said that nature had given to man in this nut a vivid figure of the present condition of Christianity in the world. The shell, he said, hard, barren and unprofitable, represented Methodism. The skin, bitter and useless, Presbyterianism. "Now," he proceeded, "I will show you the Holy Roman Church."

Placing the nut on the edge of the pulpit he took a book and cracked it. But the kernel, representing the Roman Church, was rotten!

This certainly was an example, in the last member of his illustration, at least, of the inspiration either of Balaam or of the beast he rode upon. Who can wonder that the ass of the son of Bosor spake, when even a rotten walnut, in the present instance, just as plainly "forbade the madness of the prophet."—*The Churchman*.

A PRESBYTERIAN paper says: "If the revision agitation continues and each church now holding the Confession of Faith revises independently the prospect for a large crop of new sects will be bright indeed. . . . According to Dr. Kerr's history there are already about twenty Presbyterian bodies adhering to the same symbols. If each divides into fragments in the course of revision there may be forty or fifty before the century closes."—*The Churchman*.